

This electronic thesis or dissertation has been downloaded from the King's Research Portal at <https://kclpure.kcl.ac.uk/portal/>



## **The Portrayal of zorn in Hartmann von Aue's Arthurian Romances and in Wolfram von Eschenbach's Parzival**

Regulski, Carol

*Awarding institution:*  
King's College London

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author and no quotation from it or information derived from it may be published without proper acknowledgement.

### **END USER LICENCE AGREEMENT**



**Unless another licence is stated on the immediately following page** this work is licensed

under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International

licence. <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

You are free to copy, distribute and transmit the work

Under the following conditions:

- Attribution: You must attribute the work in the manner specified by the author (but not in any way that suggests that they endorse you or your use of the work).
- Non Commercial: You may not use this work for commercial purposes.
- No Derivative Works - You may not alter, transform, or build upon this work.

Any of these conditions can be waived if you receive permission from the author. Your fair dealings and other rights are in no way affected by the above.

### **Take down policy**

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact [librarypure@kcl.ac.uk](mailto:librarypure@kcl.ac.uk) providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

This electronic theses or dissertation has been downloaded from the King's Research Portal at <https://kclpure.kcl.ac.uk/portal/>



**Title:** The Portrayal of zorn in Hartmann von Aue's Arthurian Romances and in Wolfram von Eschenbach's Parzival

**Author:** Carol Regulski

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author and no quotation from it or information derived from it may be published without proper acknowledgement.

#### END USER LICENSE AGREEMENT



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs 3.0 Unported License. <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/>

You are free to:

- Share: to copy, distribute and transmit the work

Under the following conditions:

- Attribution: You must attribute the work in the manner specified by the author (but not in any way that suggests that they endorse you or your use of the work).
- Non Commercial: You may not use this work for commercial purposes.
- No Derivative Works - You may not alter, transform, or build upon this work.

Any of these conditions can be waived if you receive permission from the author. Your fair dealings and other rights are in no way affected by the above.

#### Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact [librarypure@kcl.ac.uk](mailto:librarypure@kcl.ac.uk) providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

King's College London

2004

The Portrayal of *zorn* in Hartmann von Aue's Arthurian Romances and in Wolfram  
von Eschenbach's *Parzival*

A Thesis Submitted for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

by

Carol Ann Magner

### Abstract

This thesis examines the portrayal of *zorn* in Hartmann von Aue's *Erec* and *Iwein*, and in Wolfram von Eschenbach's *Parzival*. The opening chapter provides an insight into the meaning of *zorn* and examines the physical signs, symptoms, and symbols of anger, as well as its theological, moral, and social significance in the Middle Ages. Chapter 2 is devoted to the analysis of *zorn* in *Erec*, then in *Iwein*. Comparison of the two shows how Hartmann's attitude to anger changes: whereas, in *Erec*, the hero's anger can be seen in a positive light, in *Iwein*, anger is almost always problematic, particularly when associated with female characters. Chapter 3 examines *zorn* in *Parzival* under four main headings: the stories of Gahmuret, Parzival, Gawan, and the Narrator. Many of the issues surrounding *zorn* that surface in the main body of the work are foreshadowed in Books I and II. Anger is not a major issue for Gahmuret, who himself falls prey to a cycle of violence that can be seen to extend forward into the lifetime of his son. Whilst Parzival must learn to control his *zorn* and appreciate its proper use, Gawan is shown to be exemplary in this respect and to exhibit the qualities of *patientia*, restraint, and discretion essential to controlling *zorn*. The *zorn* of the narrator, which can be glimpsed at various points in the narrative, hints at Wolfram's personal concern with this emotion, particularly in the context of *minne*. Finally, a comparison between the two authors shows that Hartmann's focus is relatively narrow by comparison with Wolfram's.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>Chapter 1: Introduction .....</b>	<b>7</b>
1.0 General Comments .....	7
1.1 The Vocabulary of Anger .....	9
1.1.1 <i>zorn</i> .....	9
1.1.2 <i>erbelgen</i> .....	10
1.1.3 <i>wüeten, erwüeten</i> .....	10
1.1.4 <i>bâc, bâgen</i> .....	10
1.1.5 <i>grim</i> .....	11
1.1.6 <i>nît, haz, unminne, ungedult</i> .....	11
1.1.7 Old French Vocabulary .....	11
1.2 Anger as an Emotion or Passion .....	11
1.2.1 Physiological Symptoms .....	12
1.2.2 Cognitive Aspects of Anger .....	15
1.2.3 Pathology, Temperament and the Ages of Man .....	17
1.2.4 Colour Symbolism Associated with Anger .....	18
1.2.4.1 Red .....	18
1.2.4.1.1 Red Hair .....	19
1.2.4.2 Black .....	20
1.2.5 Animal Symbolism .....	21
1.2.5.1 Dragons .....	21
1.2.5.2 Lions .....	24
1.2.5.3 Dogs .....	25
1.2.5.4 Wolves .....	26
1.2.5.5 Ostriches .....	27
1.2.5.6 Hedgehogs .....	28
1.3 Anger as Sin .....	29
1.3.1 The Cardinal or Deadly Sins .....	29
1.3.2 Penitential Literature .....	30
1.3.3 Conventional Depictions of the Sins .....	31
1.3.4 <i>Ira</i> and <i>Desperatio</i> .....	34
1.4 The Classical Conception of Anger .....	35
1.5 The Biblical Conception of Anger .....	37

	4
1.5.1 Biblical Phrases and Admonitions .....	37
1.5.2 Biblical Exempla of Anger.....	39
1.5.2.1 Cain .....	39
1.5.2.2 Judas Iscariot .....	40
1.5.2.3 The Devil .....	41
1.5.2.4 The Wrath of God.....	41
1.6 Anger in Proverbial Wisdom and Didactic Literature.....	42
1.6.1 <i>Disticha Catonis</i> .....	43
1.6.2 Thomasin von Zerclaere: <i>Der Welsche Gast</i> .....	45
1.6.3 Freidank: <i>Bescheidenheit</i> .....	48
1.6.4 Love, Friendship and Anger .....	50
1.7 The Social Uses and Significance of Anger .....	54
1.7.1 <i>Furor Teutonicus</i> .....	58
1.7.2 The Anger of Welshmen .....	59
1.7.3 <i>Furor heroicus</i> .....	60
<b>Chapter 2: The Arthurian Works of Hartmann von Aue.....</b>	<b>61</b>
2.1 <i>Erec</i> .....	61
2.1.1 Introduction .....	61
2.1.2 Erec and Enite .....	61
2.1.3 Enite's Lament .....	71
2.1.4 Erec's Unknightly Opponents .....	72
2.1.5 Erec's Knightly Opponents .....	75
2.1.5.1 Iders .....	75
2.1.5.2 Galoain and Oringles.....	77
2.1.5.3 Guivreiz .....	82
2.1.5.4 Gawein and Keie .....	84
2.1.5.5 Mabonagrín .....	87
2.2 <i>Iwein</i> .....	90
2.2.1 Introduction .....	90
2.2.2 Ginover .....	93
2.2.3 Artus .....	96
2.2.4 The Wild Man .....	99
2.2.5 Askalon.....	100

2.2.6 Laudine's <i>gesinde</i> .....	101
2.2.7 Lunete .....	103
2.2.8 Laudine .....	104
2.2.8.1 Askalon's Funeral Procession .....	106
2.2.8.2 Laudine and Iwein .....	106
2.2.8.3 Laudine and Lunete .....	109
2.2.9 Iwein .....	110
2.2.9.1 Iwein's Madness .....	111
2.2.9.2 The Lion .....	115
2.2.9.3 Pesme Aventure .....	118
2.2.9.4 Iwein and Gawein .....	120
2.3 Conclusions .....	121
<b>Chapter 3: <i>Parzival</i> .....</b>	<b>127</b>
3.0 Introduction .....	127
3.1 The Gahmuret Story (4,27-112,4) .....	127
3.1.1 Patelamunt .....	127
3.1.2 Lahfilirost .....	127
3.1.3 Kanvoleis .....	128
3.1.4 Hardiz .....	129
3.1.5 Ampflise's Envoys .....	131
3.1.6 Conclusions .....	131
3.2 The Parzival Story(112,5-114,4; 116,5-337,30; 433,1-502,30; 679,1-827,30) .....	133
3.2.1 Parzival's Rise to Fame .....	133
3.2.1.1 Parzival's Youth .....	133
3.2.1.2 Lähelin and Orilus .....	135
3.2.1.3 Ither .....	141
3.2.1.4 Keie .....	145
3.2.1.5 Belrepeire .....	150
3.2.2 Parzival's First Visit to the Grail Castle.....	151
3.2.3 Parzival's Fall from Grace.....	153
3.2.3.1 Sigune's Reproach.....	153
3.2.3.2 Cundrie la surziere's Reproach .....	153

3.2.3.3 Sigune's Forgiveness.....	154
3.2.3.4 Parzival and the <i>templeis</i> .....	154
3.2.3.5 Parzival and God .....	155
3.2.4 Parzival's Path Towards Redemption .....	161
3.2.4.1 Parzival and Gawan.....	161
3.2.4.2 Parzival and Gramoflanz .....	162
3.2.4.3 Parzival and Feirefiz.....	164
3.2.4.4 Cundrie la surziere's Forgiveness .....	166
3.2.4.5 Trevrizent's 'Retraction' .....	166
3.2.5 Conclusions .....	167
3.3 The Gawan Story (298,1-432,30; 503,1-731,30) .....	170
3.3.1 Gawan: Book VI.....	171
3.3.2 Book VII.....	173
3.3.3 Book VIII .....	178
3.3.4 Books X-XIV .....	182
3.3.4.1 Plippalinot and Bene .....	182
3.3.4.2 Lit marveile .....	184
3.3.4.3 Orgeluse.....	195
3.3.4.3.1 Orgeluse and Gawan .....	196
3.3.4.3.2 Orgeluse and Gramoflanz.....	202
3.3.4.3.3 Orgeluse and Parzival.....	204
3.3.4.4 Urjans .....	205
3.3.5 Conclusions .....	207
3.4 The Narrator and <i>zorn</i> .....	210
3.5 Divine Wrath .....	215
3.6 Other Examples of <i>zorn</i> .....	218
3.7 Conclusions .....	219
<b>Chapter 4: Summary of Conclusions .....</b>	<b>222</b>
<b>BIBLIOGRAPHY .....</b>	<b>227</b>
Primary Sources and Translations.....	227
Other Works Cited.....	234



## Chapter 1: Introduction

### 1.0 General Comments

This thesis considers the significance of *zorn* in three major works of Middle High German (MHG) literature: Hartmann von Aue's *Erec* and *Iwein*, and Wolfram von Eschenbach's *Parzival*. It remains true that 'apart from a few studies, [...] very little attention has been given to the history of anger or, for that matter, most emotions other than love' (Rosenwein 1998: 1; Smail 2001: 93). Studies of the portrayal of anger in MHG literature are particularly rare.

In 1968, Giese produced his doctoral thesis on the portrayal of *minne* and *zorn* in Heinrich von Veldeke's *Eneasroman*. Whilst providing a valuable study of the vocabulary of *zorn* in the *Eneasroman*, Giese is in some doubt as to whether anger really qualifies as a theme of the work and accordingly devotes only 23 pages to it, compared to at least 100 pages on *minne*.<sup>1</sup> He makes only cursory reference to the *Roman d'Eneas* and neither cites a primary edition nor quotes a single line of the text. For comparisons with Virgil, he is reliant principally on Dittrich (1966) and does not refer to the importance of anger in the *Aeneid*. It is also somewhat surprising that a study of *minne* and *zorn* never once mentions the traditional association of the two (see 1.6.4 below).

Haug's consideration of 'Parzivals *zwîvel* und Willehalms *zorn*' (1975) is conducted in the context of Wolfram's shift from the romance to the *chanson de geste* genre. His article contains useful observations on the way in which Willehalm's *zorn* gives way to Rennewart's *zorn* at Munleun. However, he makes only passing reference to Parzival's *zorn*:

Aus der zunächst unstandesgemäßen Erziehung ergibt sich für Rennewart wie für Parzival ein Mangel an Einsicht und Erfahrung, und das bedeutet zugleich einen Mangel an höfischer Form äußerer und innerer Art. Es fehlen oder versagen *zuht* und *mâze*. An ihrer Stelle steht der *zorn*, letztlich die Verhärtung der Uneinsichtigkeit im *zwîvel*. (Haug 1975: 221)

Swisher's article on *zorn* in *Parzival* (1992) deals most directly with the theme of this thesis, although it is by no means an exhaustive study. He identifies four 'larger semantic groups' to which he allocates various examples of *zorn* from *Parzival*. The first, and largest group is entitled 'battle metaphor' and comprises examples drawn from Patelamunt and Kanvoleis, as well as Parzival's musings about the Devil (120,18f.), Parzival's confrontations with Ither, Orilus, and the *templeis*, Orgeluse's *zorn*, Gawan's

encounter with Malcreatiure, and the reference to Mars and Jupiter (789,4-11). The second group, ‘ill-fated love’ is mainly concerned with the events of Book VII, but also includes the *zorn* of *frou minne* (584,26) and the narrator (292,12-14). The third group, ‘justice and judgment’, includes various references to the wrath of God, the Urjans episode, Meljanz’s *zorn* towards Lyppaut, and the *redespæher man*. Finally, Swisher’s fourth group, ‘crisis of faith’, is reserved for Parzival’s anger towards God and for the verb *ab erzürnen* (463,1; 798,3). This attempt to ‘shoe-horn’ *zorn* in *Parzival* into various categories oversimplifies the situation and does little justice to Wolfram’s concern with the causes and consequences of *zorn* (see Chapter 3 below).

1998 was a good year for the study of anger and related emotions, as it marked the appearance of the book edited by Rosenwein entitled *Anger’s Past: The Social Uses of an Emotion in the Middle Ages*. There is only a brief mention of *Parzival* in the contribution by Hyams (1998: 113), but many of the other articles (cited hereafter by individual author) are of immense value in establishing anger as a phenomenon not restricted to the emotion that is nowadays associated with the word. In the same year, Müller’s book on the *Nibelungenlied* appeared, containing a section on *zorn* (1998: 203-08) in which he, too, argues convincingly against the narrow interpretation of *zorn* as a sign of emotional instability.

Finally, mention should be made of the publications by Bartlett (1998), on mortal enmities, and Smail (2001), on hatred. Although neither deals with anger *per se*, both discuss the legal and historical dimensions of *inimicitia*, *enmitas*, *odium* and *rancor*. As Smail remarks (2001: 90), ‘the semantic field covered by this quartet overlaps with another moral sentiment, namely, anger or wrath, conveyed by the words *ira* and *furor*’. Although the terms ‘anger’ and ‘hatred’ are used differently, as Smail points out, they are, on occasion, associated with one another, as will be seen.

The remainder of this chapter is given over to examining the various aspects of anger that are relevant to an understanding of *zorn* in *Erec*, *Iwein*, and *Parzival*. Chapter 2 deals with *zorn* in Hartmann’s Arthurian romances, whilst Chapter 3 covers *zorn* in *Parzival*, each chapter having its own conclusions. Chapter 4 then contains a summary of the general conclusions reached.

---

<sup>1</sup> For my own, rather different assessment of the importance of *zorn* in the *Eneasroman*, see Magner 1996.

## 1.1 The Vocabulary of Anger

### 1.1.1 *zorn*

Although there is some overlap between the meaning of the MHG word *zorn* and the New High German (NHG) *Zorn*, the MHG word has a wider range of meaning and grammatical usage.

According to Benecke/Müller/Zarncke (III: 905-09), the MHG noun *zorn* is one of a group of words related to ZIR, ZAR, ZÂREN, GEZORN, meaning ‘breche, reiße, zerstöre’.<sup>2</sup> Kluge (2002: 1016), on the other hand, states ‘Wie air. *drenn* ‘Streit’, gr. *dēris* ‘Streit’ und andere Substantive geht das Wort offenbar zurück auf eine Ableitung aus der Wurzel ig. \**der-* ‘spalten’, die in *zerren* dargestellt ist.’ Both derivations point to the divisive quality of *zorn*.

Four basic meanings are assigned to the noun *zorn* by Benecke/Müller/Zarncke (III: 905f.):<sup>3</sup>

- (a) ‘jede art plötzlich entstehenden unwillens, wie klein oder groß dieser sein mag’ — this is by far the most common meaning and closest to the modern understanding of *Zorn*.
- (b) ‘heftiger wortwechsel, hader, zank und streit, verweiß’ — this is the next most common meaning, indicating ‘quarrel’, ‘conflict’ or ‘dispute’.
- (c) ‘dasjenige, worüber man aufgebracht ist’ — here *zorn* refers to the cause or origin of anger or hostility.
- (d) in phrases such as ‘daz ist mir zorn’ it has the sense ‘es erregt meinen unwillen’.

In the first of these senses, akin to modern ‘anger’, *zorn* is found in the compound noun *zornmuot* (‘angry disposition’) and in prepositional phrases, such as *mit zorne* or *in zorne* (‘angrily’), *durch zorn*, *von zorne* or *vor zorne* (‘on account of anger’, ‘as a result of anger’), and *âne zorn*. The last phrase (lit. ‘without anger’) is often used in contexts where the sense is quite diluted, indicating that an action is or is intended to be uncontentious or unproblematic, e.g. ‘durch daz sô lât ez âne zorn’ (*Erec* 1350).<sup>4</sup> As a consequence, this phrase will not attract further comment unless the context is significant for our understanding of *zorn*.

In addition to the substantive form, the adjectival forms *zorn*, *zornlîch*, *zornec*, *zorneclîch* (‘angry’) and *zornvar* (‘the colour of anger’ or ‘angry-looking’) as well as

<sup>2</sup> The derivation given is Gothic ‘*taira*’, OHG ‘*ziru*’.

<sup>3</sup> See also Lexer 1992, III: cols. 1150-51; Oettli 1986: 162.

<sup>4</sup> Glossed by Lexer 1992, III: col. 1151 as ‘seid nicht böse’.

the adverbial forms *zorne*, *zornliche(n)*, *zorneclîche(n)* ('angrily') are also found, all related again to the first sense above.

The verb *zürnen*, meaning 'to be angry', 'to be agitated', is the most commonly found verbal expression of anger. It is usually used intransitively, sometimes with a preposition to indicate the person at whom anger is directed or with a subordinate clause to indicate the source of irritation. Occasionally, however, it is used transitively. Furthermore, as will be seen, it is used quite frequently as a gerund in *Parzival*. The emphatic form *gezürnen* is also found, as is *erzürnen*. The latter may be used reflexively, meaning 'to become angry' but is also found in the special sense of 'to wrest something from someone through anger' in *Parzival* (see 3.2.3.5 and 3.2.4.5 below).

#### 1.1.2 *erbelgen*

Apart from *zorn* and its derivatives, the most important word used to indicate anger is the verb *erbelgen* (Benecke/Müller/Zarncke, I: 125; Lexer 1992, I: col. 611; Oettli 1986: 29). This is an interesting verb as, unlike *zürnen* and its derivatives, it has implications for the physiological state of its subject, who is literally 'puffed up' with anger (Yeandle 1984: 239; see also 1.2.1 and 1.3.3 below).

#### 1.1.3 *wüeten*, *erwüeten*

The verbs *wüeten* ('to rage', 'to go mad') and *erwüeten* ('to become furious' or 'to work oneself up into a rage') (Benecke/Müller/Zarncke, III: 536; Lexer 1992, III: col. 984 and I: col. 703; Oettli 1986: 34 and 157) are found only in *Erec* (859; 892; 5528) and only in the context of combat (see 2.1.4 and 2.1.5.1 below).

#### 1.1.4 *bâc*, *bâgen*

The basic meaning of the noun *bâc*, which is found only in *Parzival*, is 'loud cry', but it can also signify a quarrel (Benecke/Müller/Zarncke, I: 78; Lexer 1992, I: col. 108). The verb *bâgen* similarly means 'to shout loudly' or 'to quarrel' and when it is used as a gerund, the sense of 'quarrelling' seems to predominate. However, it should be noted that the phrase 'âne bâgen' seems to have a diluted sense analagous to that of 'âne zorn', i.e. 'peacefully', and will therefore not require further comment in relation to anger.

### 1.1.5 *grim*

The noun *grim* can signify ‘anger’, ‘rage’ or ‘fury’ as well as ‘grimness’, ‘dreadfulness’ or ‘terribleness’ (Benecke/Müller/Zarncke, I: 573-75; Lexer 1992, I: cols. 1084f.; Oettli 1986: 52f.). The noun and its derivatives *grimme*, *grimmec* or *grimmeclîche* tend to characterize particularly grim or deadly earnest behaviour, usually in combat or in other fatal circumstances, and are therefore often of only passing interest as an indication of the intensity or seriousness of combat. Occasionally, however, they may indicate a particular deep and damaging anger, and this will obviously merit closer attention.

### 1.1.6 *nît, haz, unminne, ungedult*

These words all indicate feelings, vices, or circumstances that may give rise to anger or result from anger, but they should not be confused with anger itself. A detailed study of all such words is beyond the scope of this thesis; they will therefore only be examined where this sheds extra light on the meaning or significance of anger.

### 1.1.7 Old French Vocabulary

A note of caution must be sounded about the Old French word *ire* and its derivatives, since this word effectively covers two word fields, which may conveniently be termed *ire-douleur* and *ire-colère*.<sup>5</sup> Similarly, some of its substitutes — such as *corrouz*, *graim*, and *marri* — are also ambiguous. When comparing MHG texts with their Old French sources, it is therefore necessary to study the context carefully to determine whether references to *ire*, *corrouz* etc. denote grief or anger.<sup>6</sup>

## 1.2 Anger as an Emotion or Passion

Anger as a passion has both a physiological and a cognitive aspect. This was first recognized by Aristotle, who pointed out that anger could be characterized in two ways. Thus a *διαλεκτικός* or speculative philosopher might describe it as the ‘desire of retaliation, or such like’, whilst a *φυσικός* or natural philosopher might describe it as a ‘boiling of blood about the heart, or heat’ (Davidson 1908; also Fowler 1997: 16). ‘On the physical side, anger, in the individual, manifests itself in a marked disturbance of the bodily organism’, whilst ‘on the psychical side, anger is mental disturbance, displeasure, or discomposure, of a painful kind, arising from opposition, hurt, or harm

<sup>5</sup> These terms are borrowed from Kleiber 1978. See also Schalk 1980.

<sup>6</sup> Reference will be made to Kleiber 1978, where appropriate. However, in spite of Kleiber’s claim (71) to have analysed exhaustively the texts italicized in the bibliography (including *Erec et Enide*, *Yvain*, and *Perceval*), there were a number of references to *ire* which I could not find in his book. My efforts were not assisted by the lack of an index of citations.

received, operating like a reflex act' (Davidson 1908: 475). Although, as Darwin noted, 'most of our emotions are so closely connected with their expression, that they hardly exist if the body remains passive',<sup>7</sup> it is by no means the case that physiological symptoms are always described whenever anger arises in a literary context. Similarly, some of the physiological symptoms of anger may be described without any direct reference to the mental state of the individual concerned.

### 1.2.1 Physiological Symptoms

The outward signs of anger include more pronounced movements of the hands and jaws, faster respiration, dilated nostrils, change of colour in the face, flashing eyes, knit eyebrows, a loud and grating voice, gnashing of teeth, and trembling or shaking (Davidson 1908: 475; *DWb.*, XVI: cols. 96f.). These physical effects are generally linked to increased bodily heat (Wright 1997: 177).

The notion that anger is heat or fire underlies many of the metaphors for anger right up to the present day (Kövecses 1986: 12-20). Indeed, many of the physiological symptoms noted by medieval authors are still familiar today, including changes in facial colouring and expression, physical agitation, swelling or 'puffing up',<sup>8</sup> changes in the tone of voice, and sullen silence. Gregory the Great described the effects of anger as follows:

Nam irae suae stimulis accensum cor palpitat, corpus tremit, lingua se praepedit, facies ignescit, exasperantur oculi et nequaquam recognoscuntur noti. Ore quidem clamorem format, sed sensus quid loquatur ignorat. [...] Unde fit plerumque ut usque ad manus ira prosiliat. (*Moralia in Iob* V, 79)

Similar symptoms are described in Johannes de Hauvilla's *Architrenius*, when Architrenius arrives at Thylos — 'Intimus ergo tumet vultusque superfluit ira, / Purpureisque furor animi coquit ora caminis' (VI, 16f.) — and is treated to a long speech by Archytas about the evils of anger (VI, 30-72).

Thomasin von Zerclaere also describes some of the physiological effects of anger in *Der Welsche Gast* (DWG):

nît und zorn machent dicke  
vil trüeben muot und krumbe blicke,  
unnütze rede, dwerhen ganc,  
seltsæne gebærde und vil gedanc. (683-86)

<sup>7</sup> Charles Darwin, *The Expression of the Emotions in Man and Animals* as quoted in Davidson 1908: 475.

<sup>8</sup> See 1.1.2 above 'erbelgen' and 1.3.3 below.

The three texts under consideration do not preserve any direct reference to anger as heat, although Chrétien does make use of heat and fire imagery (*Yvain* 812, 1132; *Perceval* 964, 5041).<sup>9</sup>

However, references to general physical agitation, including shaking, trembling and beating the palms together, are found. In *Iwein*, the populace at Askalon's castle display symptoms of frenzy as they search for the hero. When they find Iwein's horse cut in half 'dô begunden sî von zorne toben' (1271) and they slash blindly with their swords in the hope of finding Iwein himself (1292f.; 1372-80). After Lunete has suggested that Askalon's killer must be more valiant than Askalon himself, Laudine dismisses her 'mit unsiten' (1974). Iwein himself loses his composure when he sees that the lion has been wounded: 'wander brach / sîne senfte gebærde' (5416f.).

In *Parzival*, when Cundrie la Surziere first arrives at Artus's court 'ir zuht was vertobt' (312,4). Similarly, at Bearosche, Obie 'kom dicke ûz frouwenlîchen siten: / sus flaht ir kiusche sich in zorn' (365,20f.). Finally, when Kingrimursel finds Gawan under attack at Escavalon 'durch Gâwâns nôt sîn hende er want' (411,9).<sup>10</sup>

Another common symptom of *zorn* is a loud or angry voice.<sup>11</sup> Thus, in *Erec*, Galoain speaks to Erec 'vil unritterlîch' and 'mit ungezæmen grimme / nâch unvriuntlîcher stimme' (4169-71). When Enite turns her anger towards God (5774), the woods echo her loud cries (6081-83) and 'vil lûte schrîende sî sprach' (6084). Oringles speaks 'unsenfteclîche' (6539) when his men reprove him for hitting Enite. Finally, as Mabonagrín approaches, Erec hears 'eine stimme / starc unde grimme, / diu lûte sam ein horn dôz' (8992-94).

Similarly, in *Iwein*, Askalon's voice is 'lûte sam ein horn' (701) and he calls out 'vil lûte' (710). Later, when Askalon approaches Iwein 'der gruozt in harte verre / als vîent sînen vîent sol' (1002f.). At Askalon's castle, after Iwein has been found by Lunete, 'dô huopz gesinde grôzen schal' (1225).

<sup>9</sup> Hartmann refers elsewhere to 'der heize gotes zorn' (*Gregorius* 2678).

<sup>10</sup> It is not clear exactly what emotion Kingrimursel feels at this point: the tearing of hair and wringing of hands can express both grief and anger (see 3.3.3 below).

<sup>11</sup> It should be noted that characters frequently speak 'mit zorne', 'in zorne' or 'durch zorn'. Peil's (1975: 223, fn. 23) comment on Wolfram's use of *mit zorne sprechen* is apposite in all these cases: 'Es muß offen bleiben, ob Wolfram damit der Stimme einen Ausdruckswert beilegt oder nur das hinter der Rede stehende Gefühl nennt.' Occasionally, anger is accompanied by the exact opposite of a loud voice, i.e. silence. However, this is much less frequently attested in the works under consideration, and other emotions, such as grief, may be in evidence, making it difficult to be sure of the motivation for silence. The best example is found when Erec is challenged by the first of the three robbers: 'Êrec durch sînen grimmen muot / im dehein antwort enbôt' (*Erec* 3221f.). Silence as a possible symptom of anger is not considered in Ruberg 1978.

Finally, in *Parzival*, Lahfilirost's anger 'begunde limmen / und als ein lewe brimmen' (42,13f.), suggesting that he speaks with a very loud voice.<sup>12</sup> Finally, when he leaves the Grail Castle for the first time, Parzival jumps on his horse 'al schrînde' (247,13) and 'mit pâgenden Worten' (247,15).

Darkening or distortion of the countenance is another well-attested symptom of anger, but it is not found in any of the three texts under consideration, although French literature, once again, does provide examples of this physiological symptom (*Yvain* 5938; *Perceval* 6138; 8044-87).

On two occasions, anger is associated with the eyes. In *Iwein*, the wild man's eyes are described as 'rôt, zornvar' (451), whilst in *Parzival*, when Obie sends a page to challenge Gawan, we are told:

mit zorn er wart enpfangen.  
Gâwâns ougen blicke  
in lêrten herzen schricke. (360,18-20)

However, some possible symptoms of anger are ambiguous. One such symptom is weeping, normally associated with grief. According to Weinand (1958: 135 and 64), tears prompted by *Wut*, *Zorn*, or *Haß* are 'gelegentlich belegt, doch kaum in der höfischen Dichtung', and the examples that he cites are all taken from pre-courtly literature. Similarly, in his chapter on the *Rolandslied*, Schubert (1991: 96f.) treats 'Lachen und Weinen' as evidence of 'Freude und Leid' and ignores the possibility of tears of anger. However, there are two instances where tears may be associated with *zorn*.

In *Parzival*, when Ampflise's envoys have to leave Kanvoleis with the bad news that Gahmuret is to marry Herzeloyde rather than Ampflise, we are told:

sine gerten urloubes niht,  
als lîhte in zorne noch geschiht.  
ir knappen fürsten, disiu kint  
wârn von weinen vil nâch blint. (98,11-14)

It should be stressed, however, that in this instance the tears clearly form part of an almost ritual display of anger that has little to do with personal emotion on the part of the envoys and far more to do with the public expression of a breach in social relations between Gahmuret and Ampflise (see 3.1.5 below).

Less clear cut is the occasion when the young Parzival shoots the birds: 'sô weinder unde roufte sich, / an sîn hâr kêrt er gerich' (118,9f.). However, the impulse to take revenge, albeit on himself, points to anger as the underlying emotion (see 1.2.2 below).



As with weeping, the tearing of hair is also ambiguous and can accompany anger as well as grief.<sup>13</sup> There are, in fact, three occasions in *Parzival* when the tearing of hair may signal anger. Apart from the occasion just referred to, Lahfilirost tears his hair (42,15) when he sees Gaschier.<sup>14</sup> Similarly, Kingrimursel ‘gram durch swarten unt durch vel’ (411,8) when Gawan is under attack at Escavalon. Elsewhere, the tearing of hair is more usually associated with grief (Peil 1975: 310).

Finally, clenching the fist, which might today be interpreted as a sign of determination or victory, could also be used to indicate anger. Thus, in *Parzival*, when the hero is angered by the attitude of ‘ein redespæher man’ (229,4), ‘zer fiuste twanger sus die hant / daz dez pluot ûzen nagelen schôz’ (229,12f.). The gesture clearly results from Parzival’s intention to grab his sword (229,10f.) but it also expresses his anger, which the Grail company are keen to persuade him to set aside (229,22) (see 3.2.2 below).

On the whole, the three texts under consideration offer less colourful physiological symptoms than their French sources and none of the romances can compare with some of the detailed, almost formulaic descriptions of anger found in the *chansons de geste*.<sup>15</sup>

### 1.2.2 Cognitive Aspects of Anger

The ‘desire of retaliation’ that forms part of Aristotle’s definition of anger can be seen in the frequent association of anger with revenge. This is most obviously expressed in the phrase ‘sînen zorn rechen’, meaning ‘to avenge the source of one’s anger’, which is attested in the *Nibelungenlied*, Wirnt von Gravenberc’s *Wigalois*, and Heinrich von Veldeke’s *Eneasroman*, as well as in *Erec* (Benecke/Müller/Zarneke, III: 906).

Thomasin points to the connection between anger and revenge, explaining how anger always finds an outlet — if it cannot achieve revenge physically, then it will find verbal expression, or simply fester in the mind:

zorn hât niht an im selben maht  
unde richet aller slaht.  
swaz er niht gerechen mac,  
dar kêret er der zungen slac.

<sup>12</sup> Compare Morolt’s reaction in Eilhart’s *Tristrant*, MS H: ‘dú rede tet im ser zorn / er begund brinnen ser so ain horn, / daß blâsset ser / in ainem grössen her’ (H 737-40).

<sup>13</sup> Schubert (1991: 100) states that, as gestures accompanying anger, ‘das Haareraufen oder der Griff an den Bart’ are portrayed ‘mehrmals’ in the *Rolandslied*. However, he only cites one example of tearing hair (RL 5695) and two of grasping the beard (RL 1154-57 and 8772).

<sup>14</sup> See Noltze 1995: 159: ‘Das Haareraufen oder -ausraufen hier als Zorngebärde’; also Peil 1975: 225.

<sup>15</sup> Neither Wolfram’s *Willehalm* nor any of the romances has anything to compare with the following description of Guillaume in *Aliscans*: ‘Lor comença les elç a ruïller, / Les denz a croist[r]e e la teste a lochier, / Au mal talent q’il ot prist soi a baisler’ (*Aliscans* 2712-14). See also *Aliscans* 2962-64, 3262f. (Guillaume) and 4989f. (Desramé).

swaz er niht reden getar,  
des gert doch sîn wille gar. (DWG 10087-92)

In his *Bescheidenheit*, Freidank characterizes impulsive revenge as the fool's response to anger:

Der tumbe in zorne richet,  
der wîse sich besprichet.  
Erst tump, der richet sînen zorn,  
dâ von er selbe wirt verlorn. (64,20-23)

In *Erec*, the connection between anger and revenge is made at the outset when Erec is scourged by the dwarf Malclisier:

ouch wolde er sich gerochen hân,  
wan daz er wîslîchen  
sînem zorn kunde entwîchen. (99-101)

Revenge is presented as the natural consequence of anger, which Erec wisely avoids, since he is unarmed. This relationship is reaffirmed when Erec and Enite are on their travels. After Erec's victory over the five robbers, he warns Enite about her failure to obey his orders, saying 'ir belîbet râche niht vrî' (3428) and 'ir müezet dulden den zorn' (3437), making it clear that the two are interconnected.

There are no explicit references to the connection between anger and revenge in *Iwein*, whilst in *Parzival*, the connection between anger and revenge is clear on only two occasions. When Cundrie la Surziere arrives at Artus's court for the second time, this time seeking reconciliation with Parzival, we are told 'si warp daz ein râche / ûf si verkorn wære' (779,12f.) and 'si warp al weinde umb sînen gruoze, / sô daz er zorn gein ir verlûr' (779,24f.). Later, the Princess of Brabant's predicament is described as follows:

si hete sich gar an got verlân,  
swaz zornes wart gein ir getân.  
unschulde manger an si rach. (824,19-21)

Sometimes the 'desire of retaliation' finds physical expression and the general agitation associated with anger, as portrayed in Gregory the Great's *Moralia in Iob* V, 79 (cited above), erupts into violence. Johannes de Hauvilla describes this in some detail (*Architrenius* VI, 48-64), and Thomasin also draws attention to the consequences of anger: 'bæser schimph macht haz, zorn, nôt, / zorn vîntschaft, vîntschaft tât' (DWG 667f.), stressing the unhappy condition of the angry man, which often leads to abusive behaviour (DWG 7179-96).

In *Erec*, when the unnamed Count (Galoain in *Erec et Enide*) arrives at the inn where Erec has been staying, he kicks down the door (4047f.). Similarly, when Erec challenges the giants over their treatment of Cadoc, they proceed to treat their prisoner

worse than ever (5494f.). In *Parzival*, when Keie beats Cunneware and Antanor, the violence prompts the narrator to comment ‘in zorne wonders vil geschiht’ (152,13).

Sometimes, this abusive behaviour finds principally verbal expression, leading to insulting or threatening speech. When Galoain realises that Erec has eluded him, ‘dem slâfe vluochte er sêre’ (*Erec* 4086), whilst Enite curses both Death (5913) and Erec’s sword (6073-75) in her frustration at Erec’s apparent death (‘vrouwe Ênîte zurnte vaste an got’, 5774). Furthermore, when Mabonagrî sets eyes on Erec, he ‘gruozte in ein teil vaste, / gelîch einem übelen man’ (9025f.). In *Iwein*, Laudine regrets dismissing Lunete ‘wand sî ir vluochet und sî schalt’ (2014) and curses her angry behaviour: ‘ich möhte wol verwâzen / mîne zornige site’ (2026f.). In *Parzival*, although Obie is ‘vor zorne niht diu vrîe’ (353,24), she does not hit her sister and their dispute remains ‘ir bêder strît der worte’ (358,15). However, Orgeluse provides the best examples of insulting speech prompted by anger. The narrator asks us to forgive her for ‘swaz si hât gein Gâwân / in ir zorne missetân’ (516,11f.), since she is unremittingly insulting towards Gawan up until the point where he has agreed to fight Gramoflanz. Her servant Malcreatiure behaves in a similar manner, as Gawan observes when he says ‘welt ab ir unt diu frouwe mân / mir smæhe rede bieten ...’ (521,2f.).

### 1.2.3 Pathology, Temperament and the Ages of Man

By the late fifth century BC, the human body was held to consist of four humours: blood, phlegm, yellow (or sometimes red) gall and black gall.<sup>16</sup> These humours could be correlated with the four elements, the seasons of the year, the four temperaments, and the ages of man. The temperaments were defined on the basis that a man’s character and appearance were determined by the predominance of a particular humour. The sanguine man (*sanguineus*) was characterized by a preponderance of blood, which was warm and moist, like air. The phlegmatic man (*phlegmaticus*) was characterized by a preponderance of phlegm, which was cold and moist, like water. The choleric man (*cholericus*) was characterized by a preponderance of yellow gall, which was warm and dry, like fire. Finally, the melancholic man (*melancholicus*) was characterized by a preponderance of black gall, which was cold and dry, like earth.

<sup>16</sup> For details of the history of the four humours and the four temperaments, see McIntyre 1921 and Sears 1986: 12-16.

The association of anger with the choleric temperament is perhaps unsurprising and can be traced throughout the Middle Ages.<sup>17</sup> More unexpected is the association of anger with *melancholia*, a condition associated with a preponderance of black gall or bile, yet this connection is well-attested and of considerable relevance for the interpretation of Iwein's madness (see 2.2.9.1 below).

In the Middle Ages, the ages of man could be divided into a number of stages, usually between three and twelve, which could be correlated with other natural, biblical, or theological phenomena (Sears 1986; Burrow 1986; Goodich 1989). Thus a scheme of four ages could correspond to the four bodily humours or the four temperaments, as described above, whilst schemes of seven ages had innumerable possible correspondences, including the seven deadly sins with their opposing virtues (see 1.3 below). In so far as anger is aligned with any particular age, it is usually associated with bearing arms in youth or maturity. In an anonymous text of the second or third century AD, the comment is made that youths, 'owing to a predominance of yellow gall, are spiteful and inclined to anger and when angered only slowly relax' (Sears 1986: 15). Much of the evidence is, however, of later date than the texts being considered here and it is not possible to point to a discernible pattern in the texts under consideration.<sup>18</sup> Nevertheless, the association with youth is of some interest, in so far as anger is associated with the young Parzival.

#### 1.2.4 Colour Symbolism Associated with Anger

The interpretation of colour symbolism in literature is beset with similar problems to that of colour symbolism in art, in so far as colours do not have consistent meanings and the same colour may have both positive and negative associations (Mellinkoff 1993, I: 35). The two colours most often associated with anger are red and black, but in neither case can anger be said to be a primary association of that colour, as will be seen.

##### 1.2.4.1 Red

In view of the connection between anger and body heat, the use of the colour red to symbolize anger seems only natural. This would seem to be borne out by Konrad von

---

<sup>17</sup> Burrow (1986: 12f.) discusses Bede's *De temporum ratione* (written in 725). Bede associates youth with 'red choler', Summer and fire, and describes how 'cholera vero rubea faciunt [...] iracundos' (201f). For late-medieval illustrations, see the fifteenth-century broadsheets entitled *Die vier Temperamente* (Schreiber, IV (1927): 79f., nos. 1922m and 1922o). In no. 1922o, the *colericus* is 'gech zornig fur war'.

Megenberg's description of an angry man: 'Der ist ain zornich man, der ain ungeschaffen antlütz hât und ain tunkelrôtez an der varb' (*Buch der Natur* 52, 1f.). There is, however, only one unequivocal instance of a connection between the colour red and anger in the works under consideration. This is found in *Iwein*, where the wild man's eyes are described as 'rôt, zornvar' (451).<sup>19</sup>

As direct connections between the colour red and anger are so infrequent, and the colour is otherwise widely used to describe textiles, precious stones, flowers, gold, human lips and even physiological changes quite unconnected to anger, it is difficult to determine exactly the significance of the red arms worn by Ither and Parzival in *Parzival* and by Mabonagrîn in *Erec*. In the case of Mabonagrîn, the colour of his arms seems to reflect his murderous intent and general fearsomeness, and his behaviour is characterized more by *grimme* than by *zorn* (see 2.1.5.5 below). In the case of Ither and Parzival, both characters are associated with anger but it must remain questionable whether their red arms reflect this.

#### 1.2.4.1.1 Red Hair

There are many superstitions associated with red hair, the origins of which are far from clear.<sup>20</sup> The subject is of interest because of the character of Ither in *Parzival*, who, unlike Chrétien's Red Knight, is not only redheaded but angry too (see 3.2.1.3 below). The association of anger with red hair has a long pedigree. One of the first medieval texts to expound this is the late-eleventh-century Latin epic *Ruodlieb*:

Non tibi sit rufus umquam specialis amicus.  
Si fit is iratus, non est fidei memoratus;  
Nam vehemens dira sibi stat durabilis ira.  
Tam bonus haut fuerit, aliqua fraus quin in eo sit,  
Quam vitare nequis, quin ex hac commaculeris;  
Nam tangendo picem vix expurgaris ad unguem. (V, 451-56)

<sup>18</sup> See, for instance, the fifteenth-century broadsheet entitled *Die sieben Alter und das Lebensrad* (Schreiber, IV (1927): 57f., no. 1883a): 'im xxxv jar wollen wyr / sthechē un brechē mēlich / geberde zu cryben den zor / n zu rechen'.

<sup>19</sup> Note that red eyes often have sinister associations and may be used to evoke a wild or diabolical nature (Mellinkoff, 1993, I: 124), which would not seem out of place in the case of the wild man. Konrad von Megenberg comments: 'welhes augen an der rœten dem feur geleichent, daz ist ain gruntpæsez mensch und gar widerprüechig oder ungevölgig' (*Buch der Natur*, 44,4f.). However, it should also be noted that red eyes are a classic symptom of weeping and this is attested at *Pz.* 136,6.

<sup>20</sup> See Bächtold-Stäubli, III (1930-31): cols. 1250-52 ('Haarfarbe, rot'). The significance of hair colour is not considered in Bartlett 1994.

This is the very first of twelve pieces of advice given by the King to Ruodlieb and it encapsulates an antipathy towards red hair that seems to be very ancient and widespread (Mellinkoff 1993, I: 147-59).<sup>21</sup>

Iconography provides some further evidence of a connection between red hair and anger. There is an exceptional, but very striking illustration of Cain killing Abel in the twelfth-century Mosan Park Bible, in which Cain not only has bright carrot-coloured hair but also wears all-red clothing (Mellinkoff 1993, I: 150 and II: fig. II.27).<sup>22</sup> There are also examples of Judas Iscariot being portrayed with red hair, a red beard and/or ruddy skin (Mellinkoff 1993, I: 150-54).<sup>23</sup> All three are evident in an illustration of the Last Supper in the late-twelfth-century Liutold Gospels and the evidence is particularly abundant in German art from the thirteenth century onwards (Mellinkoff 1993, I: 150f. and II: figs. VII.2-21 (incl.) and VII.34).<sup>24</sup>

In literature, the connection between red hair and anger is found again in Konrad von Würzburg's *Heinrich von Kempten*, where the Emperor Otto is described as follows:

er hete roetelehteze hâr  
und was mitalle ein übel man.  
sîn herze in argem muote bran. (8-10)<sup>25</sup>

Finally, it is worth mentioning that red hair was also associated with groups of people who were considered particularly prone to anger, most notably the Germans and the Welsh (see 1.7.1 and 1.7.2 below).

It is impossible to be certain why Wolfram decided to give Ither red hair. However, it is possible that he intended thereby to hint at an angry disposition.

#### 1.2.4.2 Black

Although darkening of the countenance is one of the classic symptoms of anger, there is no explicit association of the colour black with anger in the three texts under consideration, in spite of the example set by Chrétien's description of the elder sister of

<sup>21</sup> Mellinkoff points out that the Bible does not offer a consistent view of redheadedness, the most conspicuously redheaded or ruddy individuals in the Old Testament being Esau and David (148). References to Esau's *furor* and *indignatio* (Genesis 27.44f.), after he has sold his birthright and been tricked out of his father's blessing, could be interpreted as perpetuating the connection between red hair and anger, although he is not an entirely negative character. David, on the other hand, is generally regarded in Western Christendom as a model of kingship, in spite of his sins.

<sup>22</sup> For the connection between Cain and anger, see 1.5.2.1 below.

<sup>23</sup> For the connection between Judas and anger, see 1.5.2.2 below.

<sup>24</sup> Bächtold-Stäubli (III: col. 1251) refers to wall-paintings at Ramersdorf (ca. 1300) which show Judas with red hair. See also Baum 1922: 520.

<sup>25</sup> Cited also by Bächtold-Stäubli (III: cols. 1250f.). MS W has the variant 'zorne' in l. 10 (Schröder 1930: 41). Otto is later described as 'Der keiser übel unde rôt' (231).

Noire Espine, who becomes ‘plus noire que terre’ (*Yvain* 5938) when she discovers that her sister has found a champion.

Black is the colour of mourning, the colour of sable, the colour of bruises, and the colour of ugliness, but it is also the colour of the heathen races, and the colour of the Devil. The last two associations are combined when Wolfram describes the princes of Patelamunt as ‘die nâch der helle wâr gevar’ (*Pz.* 51,24). The association with the Devil is of some interest, in so far as the Devil is also associated with anger (see 1.5.2.3 below). It is, therefore, no surprise to find that characters such as the wild man and the mad Iwein in *Iwein*, and Cundrie la surziere in *Parzival* have black attributes.<sup>26</sup> All three are associated with anger, but they also have diabolical or ‘otherworldly’ connections.

### 1.2.5 Animal Symbolism

There is a long tradition of associating various sins or sinners or the Devil with animals (Bloomfield 1952: 28f.; 60-63; 329f., fn. 259; 351, fn. 156). One of the earliest examples is the comparison by Nilus (d. ca. 430) of an angry man to a boar, lion, fox, and poisonous viper. The comparison to a lion is subsequently found in the influential *De consolatione philosophiae* of Boethius (ca. 475-525), where we are told: ‘Irae intemperans fremit: leonis animum gestare credatur’ (4,3,18). Boethius is, in turn, cited by Bernardus Silvestris in his twelfth-century commentary on the first six books of Virgil’s *Aeneid*, where he points out that man is reduced to the level of a beast by ‘excessive delight in temporal things’ (*Commentum* III).

However, the lion is not the only animal associated with anger. Indeed, Bloomfield (1952: 246f.) lists no fewer than sixteen animals associated in some way with anger, namely: wolf, toad, boar (pig), lion, rat, hedgehog, rooster, dog, unicorn, dragon, snake, hare, seal, camel, sparrowhawk, and bear. As this list is by no means definitive or exhaustive, it is proposed to concentrate here on animals of possible relevance to anger in the three texts under consideration.

#### 1.2.5.1 Dragons

Clear-cut references to the dragon as a symbol of anger are few. Bloomfield (1952: 247) lists only a woodcut in a 1507 reprint of the *Booke Royale*, and even this is doubtful. In the fourteenth-century prose *Etymachia*, the dragon is a symbol of *invidia* (Harris 1994:

<sup>26</sup> Both the wild man and the mad Iwein have a Moorish appearance (*Iwein* 427; 3348). The exact implications of this are spelt out when we are told that Iwein uses the clothes he has been left to cover ‘die swarzen lich’ (*Iwein* 3595). Cundrie la surziere has a black pigtail (*Pz.* 313,19) and a black cloak (*Pz.* 778,19f.).

333-35). Although Harris (1994: 334, fn. 144) points out that the dragon was also associated with other sins, any specific connection to anger is again late in date, his only additional example being Berchorius's 1583 *Reductorium morale libri XIV*.

There is, however, a more subtle connection between the dragon and anger, arising from the dragon's frequent association with evil and the Devil (Harris 1994: 334, fn. 144 and 146). The seven heads of the dragon in Revelation 12.3 were sometimes interpreted as the seven deadly sins, which would include anger (see 1.3.3 below, also Harris 1994: 334, fn. 145). This is 'draco ille magnus, serpens antiquus, qui vocatur Diabolus et Satanas' (Revelation 12.9). The Devil is here associated with anger: 'vae terrae et mari quia descendit diabolus ad vos habens iram magnam sciens quod modicum tempus habet' (Revelation 12.12).<sup>27</sup> Indeed, the dragon itself is said to become angry: 'et iratus est draco in mulierem' (Revelation 12.17).

Although dragons and dragon imagery are found in all three of the texts under consideration, references in *Erec* (1925; 5199f.; 7650; 7669-79; 8037-41) and *Iwein* (3828-68) do not seem to have any special significance for our understanding of anger, but tend rather to confirm the association of the dragon with the diabolical. It should also be noted that medieval authors did not always distinguish carefully between dragons and large snakes. Indeed Isidore of Seville describes the dragon as follows: 'Draco maior cunctorum serpentium, sive omnium animantium super terram' (Speckenbach 1976: 188; see also Canby 1995: 19f.). Thus, the terms *trache*, *wurm*, *serpant* and even *tier* may all be used to refer to the dragon.<sup>28</sup>

In *Parzival*, dragons and dragon imagery are found in three main contexts, of which only the first two are relevant to our understanding of anger: Herzeloide's dream, the arms of Lalander, and the failed remedies for Anfortas's wound. Wolfram most often uses the term *trache* to signify the dragon, but he also uses the words *wurm* (104,11), *serpant* (276,10) and *tier* (476,27) in contexts where they signify dragons. On two other occasions, Wolfram uses the term *würm* to mean snakes (481,13; 736,11), but he also uses the word *würme* to refer to the legendary salamander (735,25; 757,4), thus leaving it unclear whether he visualized the salamander as a form of snake or dragon. Similar problems of identification arise with *sarapandratest* (50,5; 68,8), *gampilûn* (383,2;

<sup>27</sup> This is the only direct reference in the Bible to the Devil being angry. For other evidence of the association between anger and the Devil, see 1.5.2.3 below.

<sup>28</sup> For the snake or serpent as a symbol of anger, see Harris 1994: 340, fn. 174 and Bloomfield 1952: 247 and 422, fn. 281. Harris also notes (306, fn. 91) that the asp was sometimes associated with anger.



575,27) and *ecidemôn* (481,8; 736,10; 739,16; 741,16; 756,24; 768,24), where the nature of the beast is fundamentally unclear.<sup>29</sup>

Hatto (1980) has drawn attention to the ambivalence of the dragon imagery in Herzeloide's dream. The dragon is at once suggestive of the apocalyptic beast (Revelation 12.3ff.), synonymous with the Devil (Revelation 20.9) and sin, and of the heraldic image of power, empire and valour.<sup>30</sup> It is also associated with both Prudentia and Luxuria, with alchemy and death, and with two of the four elements, earth and air (Speckenbach 1976: 189f.; Stauch 1958: cols. 342-66).<sup>31</sup> However, the close association of this dragon image with Parzival and his youthful proclivity to anger suggest that the connection between dragons and anger was not unknown to Wolfram.

This seems to be confirmed by the use of the dragon as the emblem of Orilus and his siblings. On the surface, the brothers' dragon arms are consistent with the heraldic usage identified by Hatto, and, in this sense, the dragon symbolizes no more than the bearer's courage and nobility. However, the close association of Lâhelin and Orilus with anger seems hardly coincidental (see 3.2.1.2 below).<sup>32</sup> Furthermore, the very proliferation of the dragons in Orilus's case may point towards vanity (Lecouteux 1979: 21f.), and the way in which Wolfram describes the dragons coming to life during the contest between Parzival and Orilus invites a comparison with the apocalyptic beast.

The *sarapandratest* on Kaylet's shield (50,5; 68,8) is generally assumed to refer to a serpent's head (Nellmann 1994, II: 480). In view of the fact that *serpant* may mean serpent or dragon, however, a dragon connection cannot be ruled out. Both *teste de serpent* and *teste del dragon* are attested in heraldic contexts in Old French literature (Brault 1997: 279f.). When Kaylet is incited by Gahmuret to pitch his *sarapandratest* against the demi-griffin of Hardiz (68,8f.), this may be an allusion to the well-known image of the fight between the griffin and the dragon (Stauch 1958).<sup>33</sup> However, it is also worth noting that the other heraldic device associated with Kaylet is the ostrich and that this, like the dragon, can have connotations of anger (see 1.2.5.5 below). The

<sup>29</sup> The word *Ecideumonís* also occurs as a place name (683,20).

<sup>30</sup> For the use of the dragon as a symbol for the Devil and sin, see above. See also Schmidtke 1968: 265f. and 583f., fn. 836 and Lecouteux 1982, I: 123 and II: 183-207.

<sup>31</sup> At *Erec* 7650, the dragon is also associated with fire.

<sup>32</sup> The fact that Cunneware shares the dragon emblem does not necessarily negate any connotations of anger. Since Keie seeks Kingrun's assistance to mollify her attitude (207,1f.), it seems that she is (perhaps not unreasonably) angry with Keie. Furthermore, it is possible to see Cunneware as a source, albeit involuntary, of anger in others: her suffering at the hands of Keie provokes Parzival to seek revenge and the latter's achievements lead in turn to increasing ill-feeling towards Keie (277,1-3).

<sup>33</sup> Note, however, that the griffin is inevitably victorious in such encounters, therefore any allusion must rest purely on visual impact.

animosity between Hardiz and Kaylet is therefore perhaps reflected in their arms as well as their actions.

#### 1.2.5.2 Lions

As already stated above, the connection between lions and anger can be traced back to Boethius's *De consolacione philosophiae* and beyond (Bloomfield 1952: 246). However, the lion was also associated with other sins, particularly *superbia*, but also *luxuria*, *avaritia*, *accidia* and *inconstantia* (Harris 1994: 276-80).

In his *Buch der Natur*, Konrad von Megenberg makes several references to the connection between lions and anger. Initially, he stresses that the lion is slow to anger but fearsome once roused:

Solînus spricht, daz der leo niht leicht zûrn, er sei dann gesêrt oder gelaidigt. wenn aber er erzûrnt wirt, sô zerreizt er den zornmacher zemâl; den gestrachten tuot er niht. (143,16-19)

He goes on to state: 'etleich sprechent, daz der leo von seinem aigen zorn sterb, sô gar hitzig wirt er in im selber, wenne er übermæzicleichen zûrnet' (143,32-35). Finally, he describes the lion's behaviour when angry:

Solînus und Plinius sprechent, wenne der leo seinen sterz still hab, sô sei er sänftig und fridsam; aber daz ist selten. wenne er anhebt ze zûrnen, sô sleht er den sterz auf die erden, und sô der zorn wehset, sô gaiselt er sich selber auf dem ruck mit dem sterz. (144,3-8)

The lion is a polyvalent symbol capable of interpretation both for good and for bad (Ohly 1958-59: 7). However, in this context, its traditional associations with the Devil and with anger are of particular interest. The connection to the Devil can be traced back to the Bible (I Peter 5.8f.) (Harris 1994: 279, fn. 25).

Furthermore, there are at least three examples in the Bible of a hero killing a lion.<sup>34</sup> The heroes concerned are David (I Samuel 17.34-37), Samson (Judges 14.5f.) and Benaiah (II Samuel 23.20 and I Chronicles 11.22).<sup>35</sup> The last two incidents were interpreted in the Middle Ages as symbolic of Christ's victory over the Devil (Schmidtke 1968: 338f. and 619).

Outside the biblical context, the lion-fight as a standard heroic exploit can be traced back to classical times. Perhaps the most famous lion-fighting hero was Hercules,

<sup>34</sup> This is to say nothing of references to being saved from the mouth of the lion (e.g. Psalms 21.22; I Maccabees 2.60; II Timothy 4.17), which derive from the story of Daniel in the lions' den (Daniel 6.22; 14.31).

<sup>35</sup> The Benaiah incident is of additional interest as he first kills the two sons of Ariel, who are referred to in II Samuel 23.20 as 'duos leones'. Furthermore, in I Chronicles 11.23, Benaiah goes on to kill a huge Egyptian, five cubits tall and armed with a spear 'like a weaver's beam'. The similarity between the latter and the 'starker gebûr' encountered by Gawan in *Parzival* (569,30-570,6) may be a coincidence, but is suggestive.

whose labours included the killing of the Nemean lion.<sup>36</sup> In the Middle Ages, Hercules was often moralized as an exemplar of wisdom and, in the *Glosulae super Boethium* of William of Conches (1080-1154/60), the Nemean lion itself symbolizes anger ‘quia sapiens omnem frendentiam superfluae irae a corde suo removet’ (Chance 1994: 408).

Lions are found in all three texts under consideration. In *Erec*, the sole reference to lions occurs during Enite’s long monologue after Erec’s apparent death (5833-36) and does not seem to have any special significance with regard to anger. By contrast, in *Iwein*, the lion that the hero rescues from a dragon is closely associated with anger (see 2.2.9.2 below). It also displays some of the characteristics described above by Konrad von Megenberg. Thus when Iwein fights the steward and his two brothers, the lion obediently stands to one side of the fight and does not intervene, even when Iwein fights alone against the two brothers. Only when the steward rejoins the fray does the lion decide to act: ‘Dô dûhte den lewen er hete zît / sich ze hebenne an den strît’ (5375f.) and it launches itself at the steward ‘vil unbarmeclîchen’ (5378). Note, however, that the two brothers are not killed by the lion after they have surrendered, nor is the surviving giant at Pesme Aventure.

In *Parzival*, apart from Gawan’s lion-fight (571,1-573,29), references to lions are found in the description of Lahfilirost’s anger (42,13f.), of Cundrie la surziere, who has nails like a lion’s claws (314,7-9), and of Parzival’s fight with Feirefiz (737,19-21 and 738,19-21). This imagery is discussed in more detail below (see 3.1.2, 3.2.4.3 and 3.3.4.2 below). In all four cases, but particularly in the case of Lahfilirost’s anger and Gawan’s lion-fight, there is a strong connection to anger and the diabolical.

### 1.2.5.3 Dogs

The dog is an animal frequently associated with anger, as the numerous references compiled by Harris (1994: 325-28) show.<sup>37</sup> It is also associated to some extent with all the other deadly sins and with sin and sinners in general (Harris 1994: 327, fns. 124, 125, 126 and 127). Since it is mentioned unfavourably in the Bible and has such a

<sup>36</sup> This feat is alluded to in Heinrich von Veldeke’s *Eneasroman* during the description of Aventinus (*En.* 143,27-37) and would therefore have been known to Hartmann and Wolfram.

<sup>37</sup> To this list can be added the reference to ‘de hond der tornicheit’ in Johannes Veghe’s *Wyngaerden der sele* (Rademacher 1940: 370, l. 10).

strong association with sin, it is perhaps unsurprising that the word *hunt* is frequently used as a term of abuse in Middle High German (Lewis 1974: 51f.).<sup>38</sup>

As a domestic pet and hunting animal, the dog is frequently mentioned in contexts where there is no association with anger. However, there is a single reference to dogs in *Iwein* which plays on the association of this animal with anger, when the hero specifically declines to rise to Kei's provocation:

ichn wil mich mit dem munde  
niht gelichen dem hunde,  
der dâ wider grînen kan,  
sô in der ander grînet an. (875-78)

This would seem to refer to the dog's tendency to growl at other dogs, and references to this as a sign of quarrelsomeness can be traced back at least as far as Boethius: 'Ferox atque iniquus linguam litigiis exercet: cani comparabis' (*De consolatione philosophiae* 4,3,17). Bernardus Silvestris again has something similar: 'linguam litigiis exercet: canis latrans est' (*Commentum* III). The same comparison of an insolent or quarrelsome man to a dog is also made by Roger Bacon in his *Opus majus* (Bloomfield 1952: 89). Furthermore, *rixa*, *clamor*, *indignatio* and *contumelia* regularly feature amongst the 'daughter' sins of *ira* (see 1.3.1 below).

#### 1.2.5.4 Wolves

The wolf as a symbol of anger is widely attested in medieval literature (Bloomfield 1952: 246; Harris 1994: 372, fn. 243). However, the wolf also features prominently in an extended simile in Virgil's *Aeneid*, where Turnus is compared to a raging wolf lying in wait outside an impenetrable sheepfold (IX, 59-66). Since the wolf was sacred to Mars because it reared his sons Romulus and Remus, its repeated association with Turnus binds him both to anger and to war.<sup>39</sup> Although some positive moralizations of the wolf can be found, its connotations were primarily negative and it was often associated with the Devil, as well as with *gula*, *luxuria*, *avaritia*, *superbia*, *invidia*, and hypocrisy (Harris 1994: 372, fns. 237, 242 and 243).

The image of the wolf creeping up on sheep is commonly illustrated in bestiaries (George and Yapp 1991: 50f.).<sup>40</sup> The Virgilian simile of the wolf and sheepfold is preserved in the *Roman d'Eneas* (5370-90), but with some significant changes, the most

<sup>38</sup> Lewis also draws attention to the use of the word 'dog' as a pejorative term from classical times onwards.

<sup>39</sup> See also *Aen.* IX, 565f. and Williams 1972-73 thereon.

<sup>40</sup> A colour illustration from an early-thirteenth-century manuscript is reproduced as a frontispiece to George and Yapp 1991.

striking aspect being the absence of the wolf's fury (Magner 1996). Although it is not found at all in Heinrich von Veldeke's *Eneasroman*, it is found in *Iwein*, when the hero is surrounded by Askalon's townspeople (1378-80) and where anger is very much to the fore (see 2.2.6 below). Otherwise, wolves are mentioned once in *Erec* (5834), but not in connection with anger.<sup>41</sup>

#### 1.2.5.5 Ostriches

The ostrich is found in *Physiologus* texts and in bestiaries (George and Yapp 1991: 129-30). The chief features noted are that it is flightless, in spite of having wings, that it has feet like a camel, that it buries its eggs and then abandons them, and that it has the ability to digest iron.

The ostrich is usually associated with *gula* or *acedia* (Rowland 1978: 111-15). However, in Thomas of Cantimpré's *Liber de natura rerum* (ca. 1240), ostriches are moralized as irascible men (Van den Abeele 1999: 142). Much later, Hans Sachs includes the ostrich in *Die zwölf unreynen vögel, darinn die art der gotlosen gebildet ist*. Here, the ostrich's legendary ability to swallow iron is directly associated with anger (Schmidtke 1968: 417):

Der strauß eysen verdewen kan;  
Also auch ein gotloser man  
Recht sich zur not, tobet und wüt  
Und sicht nicht auff die Gottes güt. (9-12)

References to the ostrich are found only in *Parzival*, but here in three different contexts: Lahfilirost's anger (42,10-12), Kaylet's helmet crest (39,16, 50,6 and 68,7), and Gawan's deliberations about Antikonie (406,30f.). As the last of these references has no clear relevance to the theme of anger, it will not be discussed further here.

As already stated, Kaylet's ostrich crest may be appropriate as an indication of the hostility between himself and Hardiz (see 1.2.5.1 above). However, since Wolfram makes specific mention of the ostrich being 'sunder nest' (50,6; 68,7), a reference to its apparent abandonment of its eggs would seem to be the primary association (Lewis 1974: 104f.).<sup>42</sup>

It is during the description of Lahfilirost's anger that the connection between the ostrich and anger is clearest (see 3.1.2 below). References to the ostrich's legendary digestive powers can be traced back to Pliny and forward to advertisements for Guinness, and had already passed into proverbial wisdom in the Middle Ages (Lewis

<sup>41</sup> Hartmann's reference in the *Klagebüchlein* to 'der wolf an dem spelle' (951) is difficult to interpret. It could simply be a reference to the wolf's fabled mendacity (Wolff 1972: 103).

1974:105).<sup>43</sup> In his *Buch der Natur*, Konrad von Megenberg says of the ostrich: ‘er izt eisen und verdäut daz, wan er ist gar haizer nâtûr (223,9f.) (Gerhardt 1970: 219, fn. 18). Reinmar von Zweter also states: ‘Man sagt, der strûz kunne îsen slinden’ (280,1).<sup>44</sup> Illustrations of the ostrich with iron in its beak are common in bestiaries and in heraldic contexts (Clark 1992: 39; Rowland 1978: 112).

#### 1.2.5.6 Hedgehogs<sup>45</sup>

The hedgehog as a symbol of anger is found in a late-twelfth-century manuscript in France and in Guillaume de Deguileville’s *Pélerinage de la vie humaine* (Bloomfield 1952: 246). Schmidtke (1968: 320f. and 609f., fn. 1005) refers to the hedgehog as a symbol of the Devil, but also points out that in Johannes Veghe’s fifteenth-century *Wyngaerden der sele*, the hedgehog stands for ‘den bösen, verstockten Menschen, der gegen Ermahnungen gewappnet ist’.<sup>46</sup> Later, Schmidtke (1975: 263) prints a treatise on the seven deadly sins taken from a late-fifteenth-century Mainz manuscript, in which each of the sins is represented by an animal with a twig in its mouth, on which a bird sits. The fifth animal, representing *Ira*, is described as follows:

Quinta bestia est ericius jn quo designatur ira, quia ericius, quando aliquid sentit, statim spinas se exasperat et in sua arma se recolligit. Versus:  
Ericii more senis homo stulto furore. (*Mainzer Todsiündentraktat* 19-22)

Apart from anger, the hedgehog is also associated with *invidia*, *avaritia*, and *gula* (Bloomfield 1952: 246f.; Gerlach 1970). However, the persistence of its connection to anger may be seen in the modern word *Zornigel*, defined as ‘leicht zum zorn geneigter mensch’ (*DWb.*, XVI: col. 116).

<sup>42</sup> However, Gerhardt (1970: 219-21) notes two traditions about the ostrich and its eggs.

<sup>43</sup> In fact, Pliny states that the ostrich will eat anything, and the first specific reference to iron seems to be recorded by Pierre of Beauvais in the thirteenth century (Clark 1992: 39). For the variety of meanings applied to the ostrich’s digestive powers, see Rowland 1978: 111-13. The Guinness advertisements show an ostrich clearly swallowing a pint glass whole. For proverbial wisdom about the ostrich, see *TPMA* XI (2001): ‘Strauss’, nos. 1-13.

<sup>44</sup> Wrongly cited as 286,1 by Gerhardt (1970: 219, fn. 18).

<sup>45</sup> Of similar significance is the porcupine (*istrix*), described by Konrad von Megenberg thus: ‘daz dornswein vermag sich wol auf erd und in wazzer und hât ainen rauhen ruck voller herter dorn, die sint lang und sint an der varb sam igels dorn. wenn ez zornig wirt, sô scheuzt ez die selben dorn in die hund und in die lât reht sam pfeil und wirt gar snell zornig, daz ez sich richt. alsô spricht Jacobus’ (*Buch der Natur* 142,1-7).

<sup>46</sup> Veghe’s description (34, ll. 16-21) is interesting: ‘Bernardus secht: de wreede mensche is ghelijc den eeghel, alstu em willest roeren mytter hand dyner guetliken vermaninghen so moestu eerst seen dyns selven bloet in dyn hand dan syne beteringhe, also stijf is he over all ghewapent unde besticket myt scherpen tacken syner boesheit.’ Rademacher gives the source of this as ‘ML. 183, 237, Sermon. 13 in Ps. 90, n. 5’. The notion of getting a bloody hand from tackling such a hedgehog-like person is very appropriate to Gawan’s encounter with Malcreature (see 3.3.4.3.1 below).

The sole reference to a hedgehog is to be found in *Parzival*, where Malcreatiure's hair is described as 'scharf als igels hût' (517,27) and 'igelmæzec' (521,12).<sup>47</sup> The context is such that associations of anger or of the diabolical would be appropriate (see 3.3.4.3 below). *The Millstätter Reimphysiologus* states 'Der Igil bezeichent den tiuvil harte' (Lewis 1974: 131f.), but it is worth bearing in mind that iconographical representations of both *Ira* and the Devil have the sort of spiky hair evoked by Wolfram's description.<sup>48</sup> It is perhaps also worth noting that in MS A of the Old Icelandic *Ívens saga*, when the lion is angered at the appearance of the two sons of a giant at Finnandi Atburðr, it 'knotted itself all together like a hedgehog and beat the ground with its tail' (Blaisdell 1979: 128).

### 1.3 Anger as Sin

#### 1.3.1 The Cardinal or Deadly Sins

Anger has always held a place amongst the cardinal or deadly sins.<sup>49</sup> Two of the most important figures in the development of the canonical list of sins were John Cassian (d. ca. 435) and Gregory the Great (d. 604).

Cassian identified eight principal sins in *De institutiis coenobiorum et de octo principalium vitiorum remediis* and in the *Conlationes seniorum* (Bloomfield 1952: 69; Hempel 1970: 24),<sup>50</sup> as follows:

Octo sunt principalia vitia quae humanum infestant genus, id est primum gastrimargia, quod sonat ventris ingluvies, secundum fornicatio, tertium filargyria, id est avaritia siue amor pecuniae, quartum ira, quintum tristitia, sextum acedia, id est anxietas seu taedium cordis, septimum cenodoxia, id est iactantia seu uana gloria, octavum superbia. (*Conlationes* V,2)

According to Cassian, anger is prompted by external causes (*Conlationes* V,3). He also states that the first six vices are linked to each other in a kind of hierarchy, one leading to another:

Nam de abundantia gastrimargiae fornicationem, de fornicatione filargyriam, de filargyria iram, de ira tristitiam, de tristitia acediam necesse est pullulare. (*Conlationes* V,10)

Furthermore, he distinguishes three types of anger:

Irae genera sunt tria. Unum quod exardescit intrinsecus, quod Graece θυμός dicitur. Aliud quod in verbum et opus effectumque prorumpit, quod ὀργή nuncupatur. De quibus et

<sup>47</sup> The reference to an *igel* at 206,3 is to a type of war machine used to break down walls and is found also in *Willehalm* (111,11) (Nellmann 1994, II: 562 on *Pz.* 205,30; Decke-Cornill 1985 on *Wh.* 111,11; Heinzle 1991 on *Wh.* 111,9-11).

<sup>48</sup> See fn. 77 below.

<sup>49</sup> For the distinction between the cardinal and deadly sins, and for details of how the two came to be confused, see Bloomfield 1952: 43f.

<sup>50</sup> Cassian himself explains (*De inst.* II, 9) that the first work is aimed at monks living in communities in the outside world, the second at those more concerned with the interior life, such as hermits.

apostolus: *nunc autem deponite*, inquit, *et vos omnia, iram, indignationem* [Colossians 3.8]. Tertium quod non ut illa efferuens ad horam digeritur, sed per dies et tempora reseruatur, quod μήνις dicitur. Quae omnia aequali sunt a nobis horrore damnanda. (*Conlationes* V, 11)

Subsidiary vices arise from the chief sins mentioned, thus ‘de ira homicidia, clamor et indignatio’ (*Conlationes* V, 16).

As with the other vices, anger has to be combated by its opposite, viz. *patientia* (*Conlationes*, XIX, 14-15).

It was in his *Moralia in Iob* that Gregory the Great promulgated the idea of seven chief sins, making pride (*superbia*) the root of all sin, from which the seven were derived (Bloomfield 1952: 72; Hempel 1970: 24). Discussing the line ‘Exhortationem ducum, et ululatum exercitus’ (Job 39.25), he identified pride as the queen of the sins and the seven deadly sins as her generals, with an army of other sins following behind:

Radix quippe cuncti mali superbia est, de qua, scriptura attestante, dicitur: *Initium omnis peccati superbia* [Ecclesiasticus 10.15]. Primae autem eius soboles, septem nimirum principalia uitia, de hac uirulenta radice proferuntur, scilicet inanis gloria, inuidia, ira, tristitia, auaritia, uentris ingluuies, luxuria. (*Moralia in Iob* XXXI 45,87)

Like Cassian, he also visualized each sin as springing from the previous one. In his case, anger would spring from *invidia* and, in turn, give rise to *tristitia*:

Inuidia quoque iram generat, quia quanto interno liuoris uulnere animus sauciat, tanto etiam mansuetudo tranquillitatis amittitur; et quia quasi dolens membrum tangitur, idcirco oppositae actionis manus uelut grauius pressa sentitur. Ex ira quoque tristitia oritur, quia turbata mens quo se inordinate concutit, eo addicendo confundit; et cum dulcedinem tranquillitatis amiserit, nihil hanc nisi ex perturbatione subsequens maeror pascit. (*Moralia in Iob* XXXI 45,89)

He also considered that each sin had its own army of ‘daughter’ sins: ‘Sed habent contra nos haec singula exercitum suum’ and thus anger would give rise to the following: ‘rixae tumor mentis, contumeliae, clamor, indignatio, blasphemiae’ (*Moralia in Iob* XXXI 45,88).<sup>51</sup>

### 1.3.2 Penitential Literature

Although the Gregorian catalogue of sins was ultimately the most influential in the West, the Cassianic scheme also persisted well into the Middle Ages (Bloomfield 1952: 73f.). In particular, Cassian’s scheme of eight chief sins was often followed in penitential handbooks, which offered guidance for confessors by prescribing tariffs of penance for a variety of sins and, together with sermons, played an important part in popularizing the concept of the cardinal sins (Bloomfield 1952: 97-99).<sup>52</sup>

<sup>51</sup> The idea of one sin as the ‘mother’ of others is found elsewhere. According to Salvian, *De gubernatione Dei* III,12, anger is the mother of hatred: ‘ira mater est odii. et ideo saluator excludere iram uoluit, ne ex ira odium nasceretur’ (cited by Schumacher 1996: 51, fn. 187).

<sup>52</sup> For examples of penitential literature, see Bieler 1963 and McNeill and Gamer 1938.



Where the handbooks offered advice on remedies for sin, this was often in the form of the so-called ‘doctrine of contraries’ espoused by Cassian, that the vices could be cured by their opposing virtues (McNeill and Gamer 1938: 44f.). This is found in some of the earliest texts and is repeated in later handbooks. Thus, the earliest Irish Penitential, the *Penitential of Vinnian*, is very specific about the dangers posed by the cardinal sins: ‘Si quis clericus iracundus aut inuidus aut detractor aut tristis aut cupidus, magna sunt peccata haec et capitalia et occidunt animam et demergunt eam in profundum inferni’ and prescribes ‘patientia pro ira’, quoting from the Bible (James 1.20) ‘*Iracundia viri iustitiam Dei non operatur*’ (Bieler 1963: 3f. and 74-95, especially 84f.; McNeill and Gamer 1938: 92f.). The *Penitential of Cummean* is more specific: ‘Statuunt itaque ut octo principalia uitia humanae salutis contraria his octo contrariis remediis sanantur. Uetus namque proverbium est: Contraria contrariis sanantur.’ The fourth chapter, ‘De ira’, prescribes penances for being angry, for murder, for quarrels leading to assault, and for sins of the tongue or mind prompted by anger (Bieler 1963: 5-7 and 108-35, especially 118-21; McNeill and Gamer 1938: 98-117). The so-called *Bigotian Penitential*, Chapter IV, ‘De ira’ deals with the ‘daughter’ sins of anger: ‘Ira, ut praediximus, gignit homicidia, clamorem, indignationem, rixam, tumorem mentis, contumelias, obprobria’ (Bieler 1963: 226-33; McNeill and Gamer 1938: 148-55).

Penitential literature is of interest with regard to *Parzival*, since Trevrizent’s counselling of the hero in Book IX has some similarities with the procedure for confession laid down in some of the handbooks.<sup>53</sup> Furthermore, Trevrizent’s warnings about the dangers of *hōchvart* (*superbia*) (472,13-17) and his exhortations to espouse *diemuot* (*humilitas*) — ‘nu kêrt an diemuot iweren sin’ (798,30) — represent a classic application of the Cassianic ‘doctrine of contraries’. Nevertheless, the relevance is general, rather than specific to anger, and cannot therefore be pursued further at this point.

### 1.3.3 Conventional Depictions of the Sins

The sins continued to be the subject of theological and ethical treatises and of a wide variety of didactic literature throughout the Middle Ages. Over the course of time, their treatment in both literature and art was often influenced by one or more of a number of metaphors that came to be associated with the vices and virtues. These metaphors

provided a structure for the organisation of texts and images.<sup>54</sup> For the purposes of this study, the most important metaphor was that of a battle (*conflictus*) between the vices and the virtues.

The idea of a *conflictus* gave rise to both dynamic and static representations of the sins in medieval art and literature.<sup>55</sup> These representations were influenced principally by the fourth-century Roman poet Prudentius's *Psychomachia*, in which a series of vices is fought and defeated by a succession of Christian virtues as part of a battle for the soul of man. The principal vices encountered in the *Psychomachia* do not correspond exactly to either the Cassianic or the Gregorian scheme of cardinal sins. Nevertheless, the idea of a battle between good and evil and the portrayal of some of the individual vices were extraordinarily influential. The main vices appear in the following order: *Fidem Veterum Cultura Deorum* (ll. 21-39); *Sodomita Libido* (ll. 40-108); *Ira* (ll. 109-77); *Superbia* (ll. 178-309); *Luxuria* (ll. 310-453); *Avaritia* (ll. 454-628); *Discordia* (ll. 665-725). The defeat of the vices is described in increasing detail, culminating in the description of *Avaritia*. The subsequent appearance of *Discordia* seems to represent a warning against complacency.

The initial description of *Ira* is of considerable relevance to the current study:

hanc procul Ira tumens, spumanti fervida rictu,  
sanguinea intorquens subfuso lumina felle,  
ut belli exsortem teloque et voce lacescit,  
inpatiensque morae conto petit, increpat ore,  
hirsutas quatiens galeato in vertice cristas. (*Psychomachia* 113-17)

The association of swelling ('tumens') with anger is reflected in the MHG verb *erbelgen* (see 1.1.2 above). Bloodshot or red eyes ('sanguinea ... lumina') are also found in descriptions of angry individuals (see 1.2.4.1 above). The reference to gall ('subfuso ... felle') reflects late antique and medieval ideas about the pathological origins of anger in a surfeit of bile or gall (see 1.2.3 above). Impatience ('inpatiensque morae'), the resort to weapons ('conto petit') and to insults ('increpat ore') are all common symptoms of anger in medieval texts, as will be seen. However, the shaking of

---

<sup>53</sup> See, for instance, the excerpts printed by McNeill and Gamer (1938: 295-345) from the so-called *Poenitentiale Romanum* of Halitgar (ca. 830), *De synodalibus causis et disciplinis ecclesiasticis* of Regino of Prüm (ca. 906) and the *Corrector et medicus* of Burchard of Worms (1008-12). For the practice of lay confession, see Blank 1971: 143-48.

<sup>54</sup> Newhauser (1993: 156-65) lists the following six conventions found in treatises on vices and virtues: ladder/steps; journey; medicine; tree; battle of vices and virtues; beast with seven heads. Gill, on the other hand, has identified eight different schemata for depicting the seven deadly sins in English wall paintings: tree; wheel; individual scenes; from naked man; from woman (speared by death); around man; Frau Welt; mounted on animals.

*Ira*'s shaggy helmet crest (l. 117) seems to give way to representations of *Ira* with dishevelled hair.<sup>56</sup>

A further important aspect is the way in which *Ira* meets her end in the *Psychomachia*. Unlike the other vices, who are in turn trampled, put to the sword, decapitated, stoned, strangled, and speared, *Ira* succumbs to self-destruction. After her spear has failed to penetrate *Patientia*'s armour and her sword has shattered on *Patientia*'s helmet, she impales herself on one of her own discarded weapons. Thus anger proves to be its own worst enemy: 'ipsa sibi est hostis vesania seque furendo / interimit moriturque suis ignea telis' (*Psychomachia* 160f.).<sup>57</sup> Representations of *Ira* stabbing herself are common in medieval art.<sup>58</sup> The connection between anger and suicide is an enduring one that survives in a number of literary texts and is also preserved in a persistent association of anger with *desperatio* in religious and didactic literature (see 1.3.4 below). The association of anger with heat or fire ('ignea') is likewise common (see 1.2.1 above). There are also a number of instances where a combatant's sword shatters on the opponent's helmet and where comparison with the confrontation between *Ira* and *Patientia* adds an interesting perspective.<sup>59</sup>

Of the other conventional depictions of the seven deadly sins, it is perhaps worth mentioning that in a number of treatises from the later Middle Ages, the sins are associated with the seven heads of the red dragon found in Revelation 12.3 or the seven heads of the beast rising from the sea in Revelation 13.1ff. (Newhauser 1993: 163-65). Since the seven deadly sins invariably include anger, this provides a connection, albeit tenuous, between dragons and anger (see 1.2.5.1 above).

---

<sup>55</sup> For details of the battle of the vices and the virtues and the role played by Prudentius's *Psychomachia*, see Bloomfield 1952: 101f. and *passim* (see index); Newhauser 1993: 161-63; Katzenellenbogen 1989: 1-21; Hempel 1970:194-96; Norman 1988.

<sup>56</sup> See Little 1998: 14-19. As he (19) states: 'This way of depicting *Ira* had been bolstered in the meantime by texts associating Anger's appearance with that of the Devil.' Rehm (1994: 67 and Fig. 11d) also draws attention to an example of *Ira* tearing her hair.

<sup>57</sup> The earliest surviving illustrated manuscripts of the *Psychomachia* date to the ninth century. One of them, thought to have originated in South Germany, devotes four pages to a graphic portrayal of the confrontation between *Patientia* and *Ira* (Little 1998: 14-18).

<sup>58</sup> See Little 1998: figs. 4, 5, 6, and 7. Rehm (1994: 80, 86, 88, and 100, also Figs. 12, 16, 17, and 19) mentions a number of instances where *Ira* is shown stabbing herself (or himself). O'Reilly (1988: 51-58) refers to the 'very long iconographic history in many media' of the 'self-impaling figure of *Ira*', listing several examples.

<sup>59</sup> Parzival's sword shatters in his fight with Feirefiz (*Pz.* 744,10f.). It is also possible that Guivreiz's sword shatters in his first fight with Erec, following the reading of Wolfenbüttel fragment II,82f. (Cormeau/Gärtner 1985: 143). See 2.1.5.3 and 3.2.4.3 below.

### 1.3.4 *Ira* and *Desperatio*

As has already been noted above, both Cassian and Gregory the Great envisaged anger leading to other sins. This could happen in one of two ways: firstly, as a cardinal sin, anger generated a number of lesser, ‘daughter’ sins; secondly, as part of a chain of cardinal sins, anger would naturally lead on to the next sin in the chain. In order to see the relationship between *ira* and *desperatio*, it is necessary to focus on the latter aspect.

Both men originally stated that *ira* would generate *tristitia*. However, over the course of time, *tristitia* was eventually replaced by *acedia*, the next sin in the Cassianic chain of sins (Wenzel 1967: 23-46). Originally, *acedia* meant rather more than ‘sloth’: it presented a particular danger to monks since it designated a kind of boredom with and loss of interest in one’s duties towards God, leading to the abandonment of the religious life (Wenzel 1967: 3-22). *Tristitia*, on the other hand, had two aspects: one positive and one negative. Cassian described the good kind as ‘that which arises from remorse for one’s sins or the desire for perfection’, whereas the bad kind arises from ‘the frustration of worldly desires’ (Wenzel 1967: 26). Clearly, only the second kind is sinful.

Cassian envisaged the following ‘daughter’ sins springing from *tristitia*: *rancor*, *pusillanimitas*, *amaritudo*, and *desperatio*, whilst from *acedia* would spring: *otiositas*, *somnolentia*, *importunitas*, *inquietudo*, *pervagatio*, *instabilitas mentis et corporis*, *verbositas*, and *curiositas*. Gregory the Great’s list of *tristitia*’s ‘daughter’ sins seems to suggest a fusion of the two sins (Wenzel 1967: 23f.): *malitia*, *rancor*, *pusillanimitas*, *desperatio*, *torpor circa praecepta*, and *vagatio mentis erga illicita*. *Desperatio* features in both lists, as do *rancor* and *pusillanimitas*.<sup>60</sup>

*Desperatio* itself is the opposite of *spes*, the Christian virtue of hope. It signifies the abandonment of all hope of divine mercy, a conviction of being beyond salvation (Schmitt 1976: 4f.). At its worst, it leads to suicide and eternal damnation (Murray 2000: 369-95). Thus in illustrations of the battle between the vices and virtues or in pairings of virtues with their opposed vices, *Spes* and *Desperatio* are to be found in addition to the traditional Prudentian pairing of *Patientia* and *Ira*.<sup>61</sup> Where found,

<sup>60</sup> The inclusion of *rancor* opens the way for anger to be seen as a consequence of *desperatio*, as well as a cause.

<sup>61</sup> Katzenellenbogen (1989: 20, fn. 2 and 75f.) notes a late-thirteenth-century example at Naumburg and an early-thirteenth-century example at Notre-Dame in Paris.

*Desperatio* tends to supplant *Ira* as the suicide, the latter to be seen either tearing her clothes from her breast or threatening violence.<sup>62</sup>

The gradual transfer of the Psychomachian image of the suicide from *Ira* to *Desperatio* is also comprehensible in terms of the growing association of *Patientia* and *Perseverantia* with *Fortitudo*. In fact, this association has its roots in Cicero's *De inventione* and was also influenced by Macrobius's *In Somnium Scipionis* (O'Reilly 1988: 58 and 125-31). 'By the thirteenth century therefore, Despair was a familiar aspect of the fourth capital sin Acedia (or Tristitia), opposed by Fortitudo whose classical facets Patientia and Perseverantia [...] offered Christ-like hopeful endurance of suffering and perseverance in good works as *remedia*' (O'Reilly 1988: 142).

The classic biblical examples of *Desperatio* are Cain and Judas (Wenzel 1967: 101).<sup>63</sup> This is of some interest, since these two characters are also associated with anger (see 1.5.2.1 and 1.5.2.2 below).<sup>64</sup>

#### 1.4 The Classical Conception of Anger

Hellenistic philosophers generally held a positive view of anger, provided that it was exercised in the right way. Although Plato recognized that anger had destructive potential, he also felt that it could be used constructively by both individual and state as a legitimate defence mechanism and as a motivational force (Wright 1997: 171). Moving on from this, Aristotle dealt most fully with anger in his *Nicomachean Ethics*, where he defined 'good temper' as a mean between irascibility and inertia: 'the man who is angry at the right things and with the right people, and, further, as he ought, when he ought, and as long as he ought, is praised' (IV.5: 1125<sup>b</sup>,30-35).

The influence of Hellenistic thought on medieval writers was limited by the inaccessibility of many of the texts due to lack of knowledge of Greek. Until the twelfth century, the only work of Plato known to the West was the first third of the *Timaeus*, which had been translated into Latin by Chalcidius in the late fourth century.

---

<sup>62</sup> Bloomfield (1952: 103f.) cites the example of Giotto's *Last Judgment*, where *Desperatio* can be seen hanging herself, whilst *Ira* has a swollen face and tilts back her head, and a similar, though later example (ca. 1350) at the Ducal Palace in Venice. In addition to the examples at Naumburg and Notre Dame (see fn. 61 above), Katzenellenbogen (1989) also mentions examples of *Desperatio* killing herself at Ste Madeleine at Vézelay (59, fn. 3), at Chartres Cathedral (80, fn. 1, paired with *Spes*), at Rheims Cathedral (82, fn. 2, paired with *Spes*), and at Auxerre Cathedral (83, fn. 1, paired with *Patientia*). Unless both vices are portrayed, it is sometimes difficult to distinguish *Ira* and *Desperatio* in the absence of an identifying label.

<sup>63</sup> See also O'Reilly (1988: 140 and 143) on Judas.

Chalcidius's text survives in over 165 MSS and was frequently glossed and commented on from the eleventh century onwards (Hankins 1987). Although some of Aristotle's logical works were translated into Latin in the fourth and fifth centuries, Aristotelian ideas did not have much impact until the remainder of his works were translated from the late twelfth century onwards (Wallace 1982). The flowering of medieval German literature (1170-1230) took place at a time when Aristotle's works were beginning to be more widely known but had not yet reached the height of their influence. It is therefore hard to assess how much influence Hellenistic thought had on writers at this time.

By contrast, some of the Latin works of Stoic philosophy would have been comparatively well-known. The Stoics could see nothing good in any of the emotions. In *Tusculans* 4, Cicero described anger as the most degrading of vices and a form of *insania* (Wright 1997: 183). Seneca likewise denied anger any validity (Gill 1997).<sup>65</sup> Cicero's *Tusculan Disputations* were not well-known in the early Middle Ages, but had become well established in medieval libraries by the end of the eleventh century (Reynolds 1983: 132-35). Furthermore, whilst Seneca's *De ira*, along with many of his *Dialogues*, was largely unknown before the late thirteenth century, his *Letters* (especially nos. 1-88) were extremely popular in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries (Reynolds 1983: 357-75).

Classical wisdom was also preserved in the *sententiae* of Publilius Syrus, a late Republican author. Over 700 verses deriving from five different sources survive in about 150 MSS, and these verses may already have been circulating in alphabetical collections by the time of the Elder Seneca (Reynolds 1983: 327-29).

Finally, anger plays a prominent part in some of the most popular Latin epic poetry that was read in the Middle Ages, particularly in Virgil's *Aeneid*, Lucan's *Bellum civile* and Statius's *Thebaid*. The full extent of the influence of these works on Hartmann and

---

<sup>64</sup> O'Reilly (1988: 140) states 'The later Middle Ages saw the popularisation of an image which both preserved the important conception of Despair as a suicide yet allowed Patientia her well-established association with suicidal Ira. The image depicted Judas ....' Unfortunately, she does not elaborate on the connection with *Ira*.

<sup>65</sup> Gill succinctly describes the standpoint of Cicero and Seneca thus: 'These Roman thinkers reject the Peripatetic view that virtue consists in setting a proper limit (*modus*) to emotion, and that 'moderate emotion' (*metriopatheia*) is ethically acceptable. Rather, they maintain that to give way to emotion at all [...] is to throw oneself 'headlong' (*praeceps*), as though from a precipice, into a passionate state that one can no longer control'. See also Fantham 1997: 188 (fn. 9), where she draws attention to Seneca's denial of the usefulness of anger in battle.

Wolfram is difficult to assess, but there is certainly evidence to suggest that Hartmann had some familiarity with Lucan's work.<sup>66</sup>

### 1.5 The Biblical Conception of Anger

A comprehensive analysis of the many biblical references to anger (*ira*) or wrath (*iracundia*) is impossible here.<sup>67</sup> I propose, therefore, to concentrate on some of the better-known biblical phrases and admonitions that passed into theological or moralizing texts about anger and on biblical characters associated with anger. It will also be necessary to treat briefly the biblical portrayal of the wrath of God.

#### 1.5.1 Biblical Phrases and Admonitions

Perhaps one of the most direct admonitions is found at Colossians 3.8: 'nunc autem deponite et vos omnia iram indignationem malitiam blasphemiam turpem sermoniam de ore vestro.'<sup>68</sup> This is cited by Cassian at the point where he distinguishes three types of anger (*Conlationes* V,11), adding 'Quae omnia aequali sunt a nobis horrore damnanda'. A similar entreaty can be found at Ephesians 4.31: 'omnis amaritudo et ira et indignatio et clamor et blasphemia tollatur a vobis cum omni malitia' and this is cited by Cassian as he describes how other sins derive from the seven capital sins (*Conlationes* V,16).<sup>69</sup>

However, not only should one put aside one's own anger – one should also avoid the company of men given to anger: 'noli esse amicus homini iracundo neque ambules cum viro furioso' (Proverbs 22.24) and 'cum iracundo non facias rixam cum audace non eas in desertum quoniam quasi nihil est ante illum sanguis et ubi non est adiutorium elidet te' (Ecclesiasticus 8.19). For angry men cause nothing but trouble and are prone to sin: 'sicut carbones ad prunam et ligna ad ignem sic homo iracundus suscitatur rixas' (Proverbs 26.21) and 'vir iracundus provocat rixas et qui ad indignandum facilis est erit ad peccata proclivior' (Proverbs 29.22).

---

<sup>66</sup> Hartmann refers to Lucan's portrayal of Erichtho at *Erec* 5216-25. He also mentions Dido and Eneas, giving a brief résumé of the story of the *Aeneid* (*Erec* 7545-81), but this could have been gleaned from Heinrich von Veldeke's *Eneasroman* or from the anonymous Old French *Roman d'Eneas*. The same comments would apply to Wolfram's references to characters and episodes from the *Aeneid* (*Pz.* 399,11-14; 481,30-482,4; 504,25-27; 589,8f. etc.), but it is clear that Wolfram was also familiar with the tradition of Virgil the magician (656,15-17).

<sup>67</sup> A brief scan of the references listed by Dutripon (1868: 692-95) reveals roughly five hundred entries.

<sup>68</sup> Not cited by Duckworth (1980 and 1985).

<sup>69</sup> See also Ecclesiastes 11.10: 'aufer iram a corde tuo et amove malitiam a carne tua' and I Peter 2.1: 'deponentes igitur omnem malitiam, et omnem dolum et simulationes et invidias et omnes detractiones'. Ecclesiasticus 27.33-28.14 advises against anger and in favour of forgiveness.

Anger is often associated with foolishness.<sup>70</sup> Thus ‘vere stultum interficit iracundia’ (Job 5.2); ‘fatuus statim indicat iram suam qui autem dissimulat iniuriam callidus est’ (Proverbs 12.16); ‘grave est saxum et onerosa harena sed ira stulti utroque gravior / ira non habet misericordiam nec erumpens furor et impetum concitati ferre quis poterit’ (Proverbs 27.3f.). Furthermore, we are reminded ‘ne velox sis ad irascendum quia ira in sinu stulti requiescit’ (Ecclesiastes 7.10) and ‘sit autem omnis homo velox ad audiendum tardus autem ad loquendum et tardus ad iram / ira enim viri iustitiam Dei non operatur’ (James 1.19f.).

It follows from the latter injunction to be ‘slow to anger’ that anger is not always dismissed out of hand. Rather, it is important to control it: ‘irascimini et nolite peccare sol non occidat super iracundiam vestram’ (Ephesians 4.26). However, in the Sermon on the Mount, as reported by Matthew, Jesus reminds his audience that not only will murderers be brought to account, but also ‘omnis qui irascitur fratri suo reus erit iudicio’ (Matthew 5.22). This also finds expression in I John 3.15: ‘omnis qui odit fratrem suum homicida est’, which is sometimes quoted in penitential literature in support of penances imposed for disputes.<sup>71</sup>

It is also worth noting that some variants to Ecclesiasticus 25.23 read ‘et non est ira super iram mulieris (instead of ‘inimici’)', which is followed by ‘commorari leoni et draconi placebit quam habitare cum muliere nequa’. Elsewhere, similar sentiments can be found: ‘melius est habitare in terra deserta quam cum muliere rixosa et iracunda’ (Proverbs 21.19).<sup>72</sup> As will be seen, these pronouncements may be of some significance for the interpretation of the literary treatment of female anger (see 1.7 below).

Finally, a word should be said about anger directed towards God, since this is a major issue in *Parzival* (see 3.2.3.5 below). There are a number of pronouncements on this subject in the Bible. Thus ‘qui oderunt Dominum negabunt eum et erit tempus eorum in saeculo’ (Psalms 80.16) and ‘stultitia hominis subplantat gressus eius et contra Deum fervet animo suo’ (Proverbs 19.3). However, the subject is covered in most detail in Isaiah:

et transibit per eam corruet et esuriet  
et cum esurierit irascetur et maledicet regi suo et Deo suo  
et suspiciet sursum  
et ad terram intuebitur  
et ecce tribulatio et tenebrae

<sup>70</sup> This point is pursued in more detail by Duckworth (1980: 162-72 and 1985: 140-47).

<sup>71</sup> Bieler 1963 gives three examples (see *Index biblicus*).

<sup>72</sup> See also Proverbs 21.9: ‘melius est sedere in angulo domatis quam cum muliere litigiosa et in domo communi’, which is repeated at Proverbs 25.24.



dissolutio angustia et caligo persequens  
et non poterit avolare de angustia sua (8.21-22)

The remedies for anger include soothing words, forbearance, and even bribery: ‘responsio mollis frangit iram sermo durus suscitatur furorem’ (Proverbs 15.1); ‘vir iracundus provocat rixas qui patiens est mitigat suscitatur’ (Proverbs 15.18); ‘munus absconditum extinguet iras et donum in sinu indignationem maximam’ (Proverbs 21.14).

### 1.5.2 Biblical Exemplars of Anger

There are a number of biblical characters specifically associated with anger, of which the most famous are Cain, Saul, Herod the Great and Judas Iscariot. Of these, only Cain and Judas will be discussed further, since they are the only ones found in the three texts under consideration. This will be followed by a brief discussion of the anger of the Devil, and the wrath of God.

#### 1.5.2.1 Cain

One of the first characters associated with anger is Cain. When God receives Abel’s gift but not Cain’s, we are told: ‘iratusque est Cain vehementer et concidit vultus eius’ (Genesis 4.5). Modern interpretation suggests that Cain is ‘distressed’ rather than angry at this point (Clifford and Murphy 1989: 13). Nevertheless, elsewhere the murder of Abel is represented as the fruit of anger and a departure from Wisdom: ‘ab hac ut recessit iniustus in ira sua per iram homicidii fraternitatis deperit’ (Wisdom 10.3), and Cain is cited as an example of a murderer (I John 3.12), thus guilty of one of the sins derived from anger.<sup>73</sup> The occasional portrayal of Cain with red hair may also point to a medieval association between Cain and anger (see 1.2.4.1.1 above).

In the Middle Ages, Cain invariably functioned as a negative exemplum, usually to illustrate *invidia* or *desperatio* or both. *Invidia* was often seen as the motivation behind Cain’s actions (Schumacher 1996: 335) and, according to Gregory the Great’s scheme of the seven deadly sins, *invidia* would lead naturally to *ira* (see 1.3.1 above). *Desperatio*, the abandonment of the hope of God’s grace, was one of the ‘daughter’ sins of *tristitia*, which itself derived from *ira* in both the Cassianic and Gregorian schemes of the sins (see 1.3.4 above and 1.5.2.2 below). After being arraigned for the murder of

<sup>73</sup> See 1.3.2 above for the citation of I John 3.15 in penitential literature and 1.3.1 above for *homicidia* as one of the sins thought by Cassian to derive from anger.

Abel, Cain cried out ‘maior est iniquitas mea quam ut veniam merear’ (Genesis 4.13) and this often attracted adverse comment in medieval didactic literature.<sup>74</sup>

Of the three works under consideration, Cain is mentioned only in *Parzival*. Trevrizent refers to Cain’s killing of Abel ‘umb krankez guot’ (464,16f.) and states ‘dô huop sich êrst der menschen nît’ (464,21), pointing to the significance of this deed as the original example of *invidia*. Similarly, in *Der Welsche Gast*, Thomasin states ‘Kâÿn sluoc Âbeln durch nît, / von im kom manec unsælde sît’ (DWG 11989f.). However, no direct link between Cain and anger is made.

#### 1.5.2.2 Judas Iscariot

Despite Judas’s pivotal role in the New Testament as the betrayer of Christ, details of his life, his motivation, and his fate after the betrayal are very sparse and there is no direct connection between Judas and anger in the Bible. Matthew’s account (27.3-10) of Judas’s apparent remorse and his subsequent suicide seems to have been the most influential in the Middle Ages, since Judas quickly emerged as an example of *desperatio*.<sup>75</sup> The fact that he despaired of God’s mercy and killed himself was deemed to be a greater sin than the betrayal itself (Ohly 1992: 35-42). This point is emphasized in the *Fasciculus morum*, where *desperatio* and *praesumptio* are treated in *Pars II: De ira*, in accordance with the medieval notion that *desperatio* derived from *tristitia*, which was in itself a consequence of anger (see 1.3.4 and 1.5.2.1 above): ‘Et ideo Ieronimus *Super Psalmos* dicit quod Iudas plus Deum offendit quando seipsum suspendit quam quando eum tradidit’ (Wenzel 1989: 126). The portrayal of Judas with red hair in some works of art may also point to an association between Judas and anger (see 1.2.4.1.1 above).

Of the three works under consideration, Judas is mentioned only in *Parzival*.<sup>76</sup> However, Wolfram’s three references to Judas (*Pz.* 219,25; 321,11; 634,19) are concerned more with the irony of a kiss as an act of betrayal than with any direct connection to *desperatio* or anger.

<sup>74</sup> See, for instance, the early-fourteenth-century treatise on the seven deadly sins entitled *Fasciculus Morum*. In *Pars II: De ira*, we are told that St Bernard’s comment on this line from Genesis was ‘Mentiris [...] o Chayn, quoniam sicut scintilla ignis in medio maris, sic misericordia Salvatoris ad maliciam omnis hominis’. Wenzel (1989: 126 and 133) points out that this was a commonplace attributed to various authorities, but apparently derived from Augustine.

<sup>75</sup> For a brief alternative synopsis of Judas’s fate, see Acts 1.18-20.

<sup>76</sup> Hartmann mentions Judas in *Gregorius* (2623) and in the *Klagebüchlein* (1434) but not in *Erec* or *Iwein*.

### 1.5.2.3 The Devil

The only direct association of the Devil with anger is to be found at Revelation 12.12: ‘vae terrae et mari quia descendit diabolus ad vos habens iram magnam’. Nevertheless, there are many subtle connections between the Devil, dragons, and anger (see 1.2.5.1 above).

The connection between anger and the Devil is made even more explicit in the Pseudo-Augustinian *Sermo de conscientia*, dating to the Carolingian period. Here, a contrast is made between Christ, ‘quia patientia imago est christi’, and the man who becomes angry: ‘haec imago diaboli est’ (Little 1998: 19). It is also worth bearing in mind the similarities between iconographical representations of *Ira* and the Devil.<sup>77</sup>

Dealing with *odium* and *vindicta* as ‘members’ of anger, the *Fasciculus morum* tells us:

De malo autem odio et vicioso similiter dicit Augustinus in quodam sermone: ‘Si, inquit, irasci fratri non licet sine causa aut dicere [‘racha’ aut dicere] ‘fatue’, multo magis non licet aliquid tenere in odium, per quod odium in indignacionem convertaris,’ nam huiusmodi odium hominem assimilat diabolo.<sup>78</sup>

The Devil appears only in *Parzival*, where Lucifer is mentioned in the context of the Fallen Angels (463,4 and 15; 471,17). In effect, Lucifer’s case is used to illustrate to Parzival that, where God is concerned, ‘Irn megt im ab erzürnen niht’ (463,1). As will be seen, the abandonment of anger is an important part of Parzival’s progression towards accession to the Grail Kingship (see 3.2.3.5 and 3.2.4.5 below).

### 1.5.2.4 The Wrath of God

The wrath of God is predominantly an Old Testament phenomenon and is mentioned more frequently than human anger. It is associated with God’s righteousness, his judgments, his holiness and his covenant with the Jewish people, and is directly connected to sin (McKenzie 1989: 1301f.). It can be compared to a blazing fire, to a raging storm, to a liquid that can be poured out, or to a poisonous drink (McKenzie 1989: 1302).

God’s wrath is most often directed towards the people of Israel, as a reaction to their transgressions. For instance, when the people start worshipping the golden calf, God says to Moses ‘dimitte me ut irascatur furor meus contra eos et deleam eos’ (Exodus 32.10) and it is only as a result of Moses’s intervention that the people are not

<sup>77</sup> Little 1998 also draws attention to similarities between iconographic representations of anger and the Devil — compare the demons in fig. 8 and the portrayal of Evil in fig. 9 with the picture of Anger in fig. 6.

<sup>78</sup> Wenzel (1989: 123) traces the reference to Augustine’s *De sermone Domini in monte*.

immediately subject to the wrath of God. However, God's anger can also be directed at the enemies of Israel and this is celebrated by the Israelites after the Red Sea crossing (Exodus 15.6-8).

The wrath of God may also strike individuals. As a consequence, when Uzzah touches the Ark 'iratusque est indignatione Dominus contra Ozam et percussit eum super temeritate qui mortuus est ibi iuxta arcam Dei' (II Samuel 6.7). Similarly, when Solomon worships other gods in his old age 'igitur iratus est Dominus Salomoni quod aversa esset mens eius a Domino Deo Israhel' (I Kings 11.9).

However, God is predisposed to love rather than anger and, whilst his anger may be terrible at the time, his love lasts forever: 'quoniam ad momentum est ira eius et vita in repropitiatione eius' (Psalms 29.6).<sup>79</sup> However, a man should not presume too much on God's mercy: 'misericordia enim et ira ab illo' (Ecclesiasticus 5.7).<sup>80</sup>

In the New Testament, there is only one direct reference to the wrath of God in the Gospels: 'Qui credit in Filium habet vitam aeternam qui autem incredulus est Filio non videbit vitam sed ira Dei manet super eum' (John 3.36).

Only *Parzival* contains any references to the wrath of the Christian God and these are very much in harmony with the biblical aspects outlined above (see 3.2.3.5 and 3.5 below). In particular, Trevrizent's description of God as 'al der werlde ist geveilet / bêdiu sîn minne und ouch sîn haz' (466,8f.) and 'der ze bêden sîten ist bereit, / zer minne und gein dem zorne' (467,6f.) seem to reflect closely the sentiments expressed in Ecclesiasticus 5.5-9 and 16.12, cited above.

## 1.6 Anger in Proverbial Wisdom and Didactic Literature

The *Thesaurus Proverbiorum Medii Aevi* lists 296 proverbs under *Zorn*, together with many cross-references to other relevant proverbs catalogued under different headings (TPMA XIII (2002): 'Zorn'). Of these, the overwhelming majority (228) are concerned with negative aspects of anger and only a small number (22) relate to positive aspects. The rest deal with the nature of anger and angry people. Since time and space do not permit an exhaustive study, it is proposed to concentrate on the *Disticha Catonis* (including the *Breves sententiae*), a widely used medieval schoolbook, and two MHG texts written close to the date of composition of the works examined: Thomasin von

<sup>79</sup> Psalmi iuxta Hebr. See also Isaiah 54.8: 'in momento indignationis abscondi faciem meam parumper a te et in misericordia sempiterna misertus sum tui dixit redemptor tuus Dominus'.

<sup>80</sup> See also Ecclesiasticus 16.12: 'misericordia enim et ira est cum illo potens exoratio et effundens iram'.

Zerclaere's *Der Welsche Gast*, and Freidank's *Bescheidenheit*.<sup>81</sup> This will then be followed by a section on 'Love, Friendship and Anger', an important theme not covered in these three works.

### 1.6.1 *Disticha Catonis*

The *Disticha Catonis*, so-called because they were wrongly attributed to Cato the Censor, comprise Latin distichs written in the third or fourth century, to which a number of prose *Breves sententiae* were added in Carolingian times. They were translated into almost every European language, including German in the late thirteenth century.

The *Breves sententiae* contain two pronouncements about anger: 'irascere ob rem [noli]' (no. 30) and 'iracundiam [tempera uel] rege' (no. 45). These accord with biblical injunctions to set aside or control anger and fit into a wide body of proverbs on this theme (*TPMA XIII* (2002): 'Zorn', nos. 1-54).

The *Disticha Catonis* themselves contain more specific advice. Thus 'Litem inferre cave cum quo tibi gratia iuncta est, / ira odium generat, concordia nutrit amorem' (I, 36)<sup>82</sup> is one of a number of proverbs on the theme that anger leads to hatred, quarrels and discord (*TPMA XIII* (2002): 'Zorn', no. 184). This not only accords with the biblical view of angry men (see above) but also with the Cassianic and Gregorian schemes of the sins, whereby anger generates further 'daughter' sins of this kind (see 1.3.1 above).

A distich on the desirability of moderating anger towards members of one's household (I, 37) is then followed by praise of patience: 'Quem superare potes, interdum vince ferendo, / maximum enim morum semper patientia virtus' (I, 38), which is embellished in the German translation:

Swer hât geduldige site  
dem volget êre und sælde mite:  
du überwindest mêr mit güete  
dan mit zorn und ungemüete. (*Cato* 227-30)

This ties in with the biblical idea of patience as a remedy for anger which also found its way into treatises on the seven deadly sins as part of the 'Doctrine of Contraries' (see 1.3.2 above).

<sup>81</sup> With regard to the *Disticha Catonis*, see Kesting 1978: col 1192: 'Die D.C. sind das wohl am weitesten verbreitete Schulbuch des europäischen MAs'. See also Henkel 1988: 228-31. For details of *Der Welsche Gast*, see Corneau 1995: cols. 896-902. For Freidank's *Bescheidenheit*, see Naumann 1980: cols 897-903.

<sup>82</sup> This is also preserved in the German translation: 'Habe zorn keine vrist / mit dem dir gnâde gevüege ist: / krieg und haz gebirt der zorn, / lieb wirt ûz ebenhelle geboren' (*Cato* 219-22).

The adverse effect of anger on one's judgement is reflected in the saying 'Iratu de re incerta contendere noli, / impedit ira animum, ne possis cernere verum' (II, 4).<sup>83</sup> This is a very popular topic in proverbial literature, reflecting the biblical notion that anger and justice are incompatible as well as the classical view that anger and reason are incompatible (*TPMA XIII* (2002): 'Zorn', nos. 86-147).

Another distich focuses on the need to let bygones be bygones and forget old quarrels: 'Litis praeteritae noli maledicta referre: / post inimicitias iram meminisse malorum est' (II, 15).<sup>84</sup> This is one of seven proverbs on the same theme (*TPMA XIII* (2002): 'Zorn', nos. 64-70), all but one transmitted by the Cato tradition.<sup>85</sup>

Yet another distich warns against taking too much notice of the anger of women: 'Coniugis iratae noli tu verba timere, / nam lacrimis struit insidias, cum femina plorat' (III, 20).<sup>86</sup> Again, there are many examples of proverbs of this kind, often associated with the Cato tradition (*TPMA III* (1996): 'Frau', nos. 1420-37). By contrast, the anger of one's father is to be tolerated (IV, 6).

Finally, we are warned against quarrelling with a just man: 'Contra hominem iustum prave contendere noli: / semper enim deus iniustas ulciscitur iras' (IV, 34). This is one of nineteen similar proverbs, many of which are associated with the Cato tradition (*TPMA VI* (1998): 'Kampf', nos. 105-23).<sup>87</sup>

There are a few instances where the German version lays more emphasis on anger than the Latin original. Thus where the Latin version entreates us to bear poverty patiently — 'Infantem nudum cum te natura creavit, / paupertatis onus patienter ferre memento' (I, 21) — the German version warns against being moved to anger by poverty:

Wan du nacket würde geborn,  
sô lâ dir niht wesen zorn,  
obe dir dîn armuot  
under wîlen bresten tuot. (*Cato* 175-78)

Later, where the Latin version advises us to follow the majority when deciding what to do or not do — 'Multorum disce exemplo quae facta sequaris, / quae fugias, vita est nobis aliena magistra' (III, 13) — the German version adds some additional advice:

Du solt bî manegem bilde nemen

<sup>83</sup> Again, this is preserved in the German translation: 'Durch zorn habe keine zît / von unerkannten dîngen strîft: / zorn verirret den muot, / daz ein man niht weiz waz er tuot' (*Cato* 261-64).

<sup>84</sup> This is preserved in the German as 'Gedenke niht deheine vrist / des zornes des vergezzen ist' (*Cato* 265f.).

<sup>85</sup> By 'the Cato tradition', I mean the wide body of vernacular versions of the *Disticha Catonis*.

<sup>86</sup> This is found in the German as 'Vürhte dînes wîbes wort niht vil, / sô si dir zornlich reden wil: / wîp können mit zorne kôsen / und weinende sêre lösen' (*Cato* 409-12).

<sup>87</sup> This distich is not included in the earliest German version.

welch dinc dir sülle missezemen;  
dem vrumen soltu volgen,  
dem bæsen wis erbolgen. (*Cato* 379-82)<sup>88</sup>

This may shed a little extra light on Herzeloyde's advice to the young Parzival, where she commends to him the advice of older men:

Op dich ein grâ wîse man  
zuht wil lêrn als er wol kan,  
dem soltu gerne volgen,  
und wis im niht erbolgen. (*Pz.* 127,21-24)

The notion that old men are wise is well attested in proverbs, as is the suggestion that they give good advice.<sup>89</sup> The entreaty to avoid becoming angry, which has no precedent in Chrétien's text, has been interpreted as a reference to youth's general antipathy towards correction (see 3.2.1.1 below). However, it may equally point to the need to distinguish good from bad.<sup>90</sup>

Finally, where the Latin version commends a wife's tongue when it is useful (III, 23), the German version suggests sparing her anger and following her advice without demurring, as long as she is talking sense (*Cato* 413-16).

#### 1.6.2 Thomasin von Zerclaere: *Der Welsche Gast*

Dating to 1215/16, *Der Welsche Gast* is a poem of 14752 lines containing moral guidance for the German nobility and usually preceded by a prose prologue giving an indication of the subjects that will be covered in each of its ten books in turn.<sup>91</sup>

In one of his earliest references to anger, Thomasin dwells at some length on its undesirable effects:

bæser schimph macht haz, zorn, nôt,  
zorn vîntschafft, vîntschafft tôt.  
bæser schimph macht undr gesellen  
grœzern nît dan under gellen.  
Swer volget dem nîde oder dem zorn,  
der hât sîn zuht gar verlorn.  
swer volget dem zorn, spricht unde tuot  
daz in dar nâch niht dunket guot.  
dâ von sol man sich wol bewarn  
daz man sînn zorn niht lâz volvarn.  
man sol in mit des sinnes bant  
binden zuo der zûhte want.  
swer in zorn hât schoene site,  
dem volget guotiu zuht mite.  
swer nîdet des andern sælikeit,

<sup>88</sup> MS I has the following variant for the last two lines: 'Pei den frumen solt du lernen / Von den pösen solt du kern' (Zarncke 1852: 47).

<sup>89</sup> *TPMA* I (1995): 'alt', nos. 85-119, especially no. 100 'altmannes rede stêt niht ze vâ' (*Pz.* 163,16), and 332-64.

<sup>90</sup> There are also a number of proverbs which point out that old age does not guarantee wisdom and that grey hair is a sign of age rather than sagacity (*TPMA* I (1995): 'alt', nos. 120-54).

<sup>91</sup> For the prose prologue, see Rückert 1965: 403-15.

daz kumt von herzen blœdikeit.  
 nît und zorn machent dicke  
 vil trûeben muot und krumbe blicke,  
 unnütze rede, dwerhen ganc,  
 seltsæne gebærde und vil gedanc. (DWG 667-86)

The first point to note is that *zorn* is shown to be closely related to *nît*, although Thomasin does not specifically derive one from the other as in the Cassianic and Gregorian scheme of sins already discussed. Both lead to the same physiological symptoms (683-86), all of which are typical of anger (see above).<sup>92</sup> Secondly, *zorn* is detrimental to *zuht*: this will be graphically illustrated in *Parzival* by characters such as Cundrie la Surziere and Obie (see 3.2.3.2 and 3.3.2 below). Thirdly, anger is seen to have deadly consequences (668), which is demonstrated in all three of the works under consideration, as will be seen. Fourthly, anger leads to words and actions that are later regretted, as is the case, for instance, with Parzival's killing of Ither (*Pz.* 161,7f.) (see 3.2.1.3 below).

Perhaps most importantly, the reader/audience is warned against giving free rein to anger and is entreated to apply reason to keep anger within the bounds of decency (675-78). This last point is in accordance with biblical idea that one should 'be angry but do not sin' and 'do not let the sun go down on your anger' but also points to the Aristotelian idea of moderation in all things (see 1.4 and 1.5.1 above). This is a very important theme for Thomasin, who devotes the whole of his eighth book to 'Wie man untugende ze tugenden mit der mazze bringen mach beide zorn, und ubermût, und ander untugend' (Rückert 1965: 412, H.III). In fact, Thomasin devotes far more lines in Book 8 to anger than to any other vice, stressing that even as great a vice as anger can be put to good use if properly applied:

[...] swelich man  
 sînen zorn hât beleit  
 under die bescheidenheit,  
 swie grôz untugent zorn ist,  
 er ist tugende zuo der vrist. (DWG 10074-78)<sup>93</sup>

The incompatibility of anger with reason is made abundantly clear in Book 8. Not only does anger make one 'sinnes blôz' (DWG 10080), it is also 'niftel der trunkenheit' (DWG 10081), 'der tobesühte kint' (DWG 10083), 'bevangen mit unminne' (DWG 10085) and 'hât niht an im selben maht' (DWG 10087). With the exception of

<sup>92</sup> See also DWG 7183f.: 'swelich man zornec ist, / der ist unmüezic zaller vrist' and DWG 7191-93: 'sîn varwe unde sîn schal / und sîn vuore meldent über al / daz an im diu untugent lît.'

<sup>93</sup> These words are echoed at DWG 10122-26, with the concluding remark 'daz muoz doch mit der mâze geschehen, / als ich hie hân verjehen' (DWG 10127f.).



drunkenness, all these evils can be illustrated in the three texts under consideration, as will be seen. The connection between anger and foolishness is also made:

zorn ist des toerschen mannes tôt  
und bringet den wîsen ûzer nôt:  
der wîsen zorn kumt von guot,  
der tôren kumt von übermuot. (*DWG* 10105-09)

The notion that anger is the death of the fool comes from the Bible (see 1.5.1 above, also *TPMA* XIII (2002): ‘Zorn’, nos. 207-12). However, Thomasin’s words also strongly support the idea that anger can be righteous if it is moderated in the right way and in the right circumstances:

swer sînen zorn kan mezzen wol  
mit sinne, als er mezzen sol,  
daz er in kêre an geriht  
und zürne âne reht niht  
und zürne wider die bôsheit,  
der zorn gît im sælekeit. (*DWG* 10097-102)

Once again, the Aristotelian idea of anger in the right measure as a virtue comes to the fore. The corrective potential of anger and its validity as a weapon against evil are also affirmed.<sup>94</sup>

Elsewhere, Book VI, 3 returns to the theme of the general undesirability of anger as part of a general discourse on the pleasures of virtue and the pain of vice. The man without anger has a peaceful life and can look forward to peace in the next world:

Swelich man ist âne zorn,  
der hât ein grôze senfte erkorn  
diu im zeiner andern zît  
eine grœzer senfte gît. (*DWG* 7179-82)

By contrast, the angry man can look forward to ‘einn stuol in der helle grunt’ (*DWG* 7196). Similarly, the man who can control his anger is ‘ein biderbe man’ (*DWG* 12161) and ‘sol ez vür grôze buoze hân’ (*DWG* 12165).

Thomasin also deals briefly with the remedy for anger:

Swer den zorn mîden wil,  
der sol gedenken daz er vil  
wider got hât getân,  
dem er solt sîn undertân,  
und sol gedenken zuo der vrist,  
‘sît ez alsô komen ist  
daz unser herr hât übersehen  
vil des von mir ist geschehen,  
so wil ich ouch mînn zorn lân  
dem der mir minner hât getân  
und dem der mir min schuldec ist,  
und sol vergeben zaller vrist. (*DWG* 12148-59)

<sup>94</sup> The idea of being angry with *bôsheit* is similar to the idea that one should ‘dem bösen wis erbolgen’ (*Cato* 382), see 1.6.1 above. It is likely that Thomasin was familiar with the *Cato* tradition.

This recalls Gregory the Great's advice in his *Moralia in Iob* (V,81), where he advises that every man should bear in mind his own transgressions when judging those of others, 'quia erubescit peccata non parcere, qui uel Deo uel proximo saepe se recolit parcenda peccasse'.<sup>95</sup>

Finally, Thomasin stresses the incompatibility of anger with justice:

Der rihter sich behüeten sol  
an dem geriht vor zorne wol,  
daz er deheinen wistuom mêr  
dan daz reht welle oder ger.  
swer mit zorne rihten wil,  
der schendet sîn gerihte vil,  
wan ez ez geriht niht heizen sol:  
ez mac râche heizen wol. (DWG 12559-66)

This is in accordance with the biblical injunction to be 'slow to anger, because the anger of man does not effect the justice of God' and is reflected in proverbial wisdom on the same subject (*TPMA* IX (1999): 'richten', nos. 60-62; XIII (2002): 'Zorn', nos. 144-47).

### 1.6.3 Freidank: *Bescheidenheit*

Freidank's *Bescheidenheit* is a collection of pithy sayings, often in the form of rhyming couplets, dating to not long before the author's death in 1233. Since there is no uniformity in the number or order of the sayings transmitted, an exhaustive analysis of references to *zorn* in *Bescheidenheit* will not be attempted here, but rather a brief overview of relevant sayings.

One of the first in a group of references to anger is 'Süeziu rede senftet zorn' (64,12), which recalls Proverbs 15.1: 'Responsio mollis frangit iram' and is part of a wider tradition of proverbial wisdom on this subject.<sup>96</sup>

The next relevant couplet is 'Des mannes witze ein ende hât, / swenne in grôzer zorn bestât' (64,16f.). This points to the proverbial incompatibility of anger with reason, which can be traced back to the works of Cicero and Seneca.<sup>97</sup> A similar sentiment is expressed a few lines later: 'Swere in zorne frâget, wer er sî, / da ist niht guoter witze bî' (64,24-65,1).

Following on from this, 'Swere in zorne ist wol gezogen, / dâ hât tugent untugent betrogen' (64,18f.), which has parallels in some of Thomasin's pronouncements (*DWG*

<sup>95</sup> This is Gregory's second method of dealing with anger. The first is to call to mind the sufferings of the Saviour.

<sup>96</sup> See Bezzenberger 1872: 348f.; *TPMA* III (1996): 'Frau', nos. 1704 and 1705; *TPMA* XIII (2002): 'Wort', nos. 260-68 and 350-75, also 'Zunge', no. 125. Bezzenberger also draws attention to a similar sentiment in Cicero's *De officiis*.

<sup>97</sup> See *TPMA* XIII (2002): 'Zorn', nos. 86-134, also Bezzenberger (1872: 349) on 64,16.17, and 1.6.1 above. This point is noted also by Eifler (1969: 180).

679f.; 12155f.), underlines the importance of controlling anger (Eifler 1969: 324).

A similar sentiment, this time focusing on concealment of anger, is found later — ‘Swær sîn laster decken kan / und zorn, der ist ein wîser man’ (92,17f.). The importance of controlling or concealing one’s anger is well-attested in proverbial wisdom.<sup>98</sup>

Like Thomasin, Freidank also refers to the connection between anger and foolishness:

Der tumbe in zorne richet,  
der wîse sich besprichet.  
Erst tump, der richet sînen zorn,  
dâ von er selbe wirt verlorn. (64,20-23)

This is a variant on the biblical idea that ‘anger rests in the bosom of a fool’ (see above), here specifically condemning the impulse to take revenge. The notion that revenge is stupid when it leads to one’s own disadvantage is found occasionally in proverbial literature and appears to derive from Publilius Syrus (*TPMA IX* (1999): ‘Rache’, nos. 84-89).<sup>99</sup>

Freidank also refers to the close connection between anger and ‘sins of the tongue’. Thus he continues ‘In zorne sprichet lîhte ein man, / daz wirste, daz er danne kan’ (65,2f.). Thomasin also points out that, in anger, a man says and does things that he will later regret (*DWG* 673f.), and that anger leads to ‘unnütze rede’ (*DWG* 685) and ‘böese rede’ (*DWG* 7194). Furthermore, an angry man who cannot take revenge physically will launch a verbal attack: ‘swaz er niht gerechen mac, / dar kêret er der zungen slac’ (*DWG* 10089f.). The notion that anger leads one to say the most dreadful things appears to derive from Ovid’s *Heroides* and is found occasionally in proverbial wisdom (*TPMA XIII* (2002): ‘Zorn’, nos. 156-62).<sup>100</sup>

The next couplet refers to the human predisposition to sin: ‘Gelust, nît, hôchvart unde zorn / diu sint uns leider an geboren’ (65,4f.). This is probably a reference to the consequences of Original Sin.<sup>101</sup>

The final reference to *zorn* in this section is slightly more positive: ‘Herzelieber friunde zorn / der wirt schiere verkorn’ (65,6f.). This is a sentiment found occasionally in proverbial wisdom and will be discussed further below.<sup>102</sup>

<sup>98</sup> See Bezzenberger (1872: 349) on 64,18.19 and *TPMA XIII* (2002): ‘Zorn’, nos. 40-54. See also Eifler 1969: 161f. on variant readings in 92,17.

<sup>99</sup> The idea is undoubtedly related to the more common proverbial wisdom that revenge is in general bad when it leads to one’s own disadvantage (*TPMA IX* (1999): ‘Rache’, nos. 66-83). See also Eifler 1969: 168f.

<sup>100</sup> See also Bezzenberger (1872: 349) on 65,2.3.

<sup>101</sup> In his commentary on 65,4.5, Bezzenberger (1872: 349) cites Galatians 5.19f. ‘Manifesta autem sunt opera carnis, quae sunt fornicatio, immunditia ...’, also Wisdom 12.10 ‘naturalis malitia ipsorum’ and Psalms 5.7 ‘Ecce enim in iniquitatibus conceptus sum’.

Elsewhere, we are told ‘Sorge, zorn und trunkenheit / die tuont den siechen dicke leit’ (94,9f.). The detrimental effects of anger, worry, and drunkenness are proverbial, but the immediate source of this saying, linking all three, is unclear.<sup>103</sup>

Finally, we are reminded that harsh words can cause *zorn* as well as result from it: ‘Diu zunge reizet manegen zorn / dâ lîp mit sêle wirt verlorn’ (164,9f.). This appears to derive from Ecclesiasticus and is also found in proverbial wisdom (*TPMA* XIII (2002): ‘Zunge’, nos. 304-22).<sup>104</sup>

#### 1.6.4 Love, Friendship and Anger

There is a persistent link between love, friendship and anger in medieval literature which does not appear to have been adequately explored by scholarship to date. This link takes the form of a suggestion that anger, expressed as a lovers’ tiff or a quarrel between friends, leads to an increase in affection. It is a sentiment echoed in the modern German proverb ‘was sich liebt, das neckt sich.’<sup>105</sup>

The subject is explored in most detail in Gottfried von Straßburg’s *Tristan*. After Brangane and Isolde have been reconciled, Tristan and Isolde continue their relationship with Brangane’s assistance. The narrator describes how their love blossoms whilst it is concealed from the rest of the court, although he is concerned not to paint too rosy a picture (13020-25). This prompts a lengthy excursus (13031-73) on the subject of *zorn âne haz*. This type of anger is not only short-lived, but also actually beneficial to the lovers’ relationship. The narrator protests that anyone who thinks that anger has no place in a loving relationship has never really been in love (13034-38), for such anger is commonplace:

wan diz daz ist der Minnen site,  
hie enzündet sî gelieben mite,  
hie mite sô viuret sî den muot.  
wan alse in zorn vil wê getuot,  
sô süenet sî diu triuwe,  
so ist aber diu liebe niuwe  
und aber der triuwen mê dan ê. (13039-45)

---

<sup>102</sup> See *TPMA* IV (1997): ‘Freund’, nos. 709-15. There is also a cross-reference to nos. 233-37 (anger fosters or strengthens friendship) and to *TPMA* VII (1998): ‘Liebe’, nos. 963-80, *inter alia* (anger leads to the renewal of love). These will be examined below under 1.6.4.

<sup>103</sup> Bezenberger has nothing to offer on this couplet. For general proverbial wisdom about the detrimental effects of anger, worry, and drunkenness, see respectively *TPMA* XIII (2002): ‘Zorn’, nos. 86-147 and 156-228; *TPMA* XI (2001): ‘Sorge’, nos. 38-87; *TPMA* XI (2001): ‘trinken’, nos. 68-141 and 144-60. Eifler (1969: 323) comments: ‘Neben Sorge und übermäßigem Alkoholgenuß fügt Zorn den Kranken oft Leid zu, d.h. er verschlechtert den Zustand der ohnehin schon geschwächten Gesundheit.’

<sup>104</sup> See also Bezenberger (1872: 455) on 164,9.10.

<sup>105</sup> [Insert reference]

Indeed, anger is portrayed as one of the forces which reinvigorate love:

hie von sol liebe rîchen,  
 jungen unde niuwen  
 und viuren an den triuwen.  
 liebe armet unde altet,  
 si kuolet unde kaltet,  
 swâ sî ir viures niene hât.  
 sô der zorn an ir zegât,  
 zehant engruonet si niht.  
 swenne under vriunden geschiht  
 dekeiner slahte zornelîn,  
 so ist triuwe ie dâ diu süenaerîn,  
 vrisch und iteniuwe.  
 diz niuwet die triuwe,  
 diz liutert liebe also golt. (13060-73)

The sentiment being expressed is extremely ancient. It can be traced at least as far back as Terence (*Andria*, 555): ‘amantium irae amoris integratio’ (Okken I (1984): 475-77; *TPMA* VII (1998): ‘Liebe’, nos. 963-980). However, it is likely to be much older (Shipp 1960: 166). It was widespread in antiquity<sup>106</sup> and seems to have been equally well-known in the Middle Ages, being included in the lore passed on by Andreas Capellanus in his *De amore*:<sup>107</sup>

Crescit etiam amor, si unus amantium alteri se ostendat iratum; statim etenim timet amans vehementer, ne perpetuo duret animus concitatus amantis. (II.2,1)<sup>108</sup>

It is also found in the Old French *Roman d’Eneas*, when Eneas laments his decision to set a wedding day eight days hence and surmises that Lavinia will be cross with him:<sup>109</sup>

Ne m’en doit porter maltalant,  
 corroz ne ire longuement;  
 Amors n’a soing de longue guerre,  
 mais qui mesfet, merci doit querre;  
 se l’an li moine un po dongier,  
 at l’an s’i lest alques proier,  
 se li redoit an pardonner,  
 quant an li ot merci crîer.  
 Molt par est bone l’acordance,  
 quant il i a eü meslance,  
 et molt rest grant angenemant  
 d’amor un po de maltalant.  
 Corroz qui trop ne dure mie  
 est a amor escamonie,  
 molt l’aguise et anasprist;  
 quant uns des amanz se marrist,

<sup>106</sup> The same idea is found in Terence’s *Eunuchus*, 57-63. Barsby (1999: 94) on l. 61 reaffirms the antiquity of the sentiment and also notes (on ll. 57-70) that ll. 57-63 are quoted by Cicero in his *Tusculan Disputations* 4.76.

<sup>107</sup> This is not the place to discuss whether the *De amore* was meant to be taken seriously. However, it does illustrate the currency of the idea that quarrels strengthen love.

<sup>108</sup> Walsh (1982: 228f.) draws attention to parallels in Ovid’s *Ars amatoria* 2.451-64.

<sup>109</sup> This passage has no true parallel in Heinrich von Veldeke’s *Eneasroman*. Although Eneas does weigh up the possibility that he has offended Lavinia (334,17-335,25), this does not lead him to make generalizations about the positive aspects of anger in this context. Earlier, when Lavinia’s mother explains to her the nature of love, the emphasis is more on the mutability of the lover’s emotional state and on the healing power of love (261,27-265,19).

molt valt après l'acordemant:  
 ce est uns renovelement;  
 mes valt uns sol baisier aproef  
 que ne feisient devant neuf:  
 se n'estoit l'ire et li corroz,  
 ne seroit si buen ne si proz. (9969-90)

A similar idea is found in a rather different context in Hartmann's *Erec*.<sup>110</sup> Here, it is not a question of a quarrel between lovers, but of a quarrel between friends. Erec is angry with Gawain for tricking him into approaching Artus's court, but Gawain responds:

herre, senftet iuwern zorn.  
 jâ ist ein vriunt baz verlorn  
 bescheidenlîchen unde wol  
 dan behalten anders dan er sol.  
 wirt im ein teil ze zorne gâch,  
 er verstât sich rehtes dar nâch  
 und hât in lieber dan ê. (5070-76)

This also appears to rest on proverbial wisdom, although the original source is obscure.<sup>111</sup>

In Wolfram's *Parzival*, the re-invigorating power of anger is implicit in the narrator's words after Obie and Meljanz have been reconciled by Obilot:<sup>112</sup>

dâ meistert frou minne  
 mit ir krefteclîchem sinne,  
 und herzenlîchiu triuwe,  
 der zweier liebe al niuwe. (396,21-24)

However, the way in which Wolfram has restyled this episode invites the reader/audience to question the value of anger in this context (see 3.3.2 below).

Contrary to what one might expect, there is no direct reference to this proverbial wisdom in respect of the relationship between Erec and Enite, although Erec's attitude to his wife throughout their absence from court is repeatedly characterized as *zorn* (see 2.1.2 below). Hartmann specifically states that Erec's behaviour is a test of Enite — 'ez was durch versuochen getân' (6781) — and he is able to assure himself of her worth. It is Enite's character that is proven 'als man daz golt sol / liutern in der esse' (6785f.), rather than the relationship between the couple.<sup>113</sup>

Similarly there is no suggestion that the relationship between Iwein and Laudine is strengthened by their quarrel. Indeed, the ending of *Iwein* leaves little doubt that Laudine has been tricked into accepting the situation, whether she likes it or not (8114-

<sup>110</sup> There is no comparable generalization in Chrétien's *Erec et Enide*.

<sup>111</sup> Note the parallel in Freidank's *Bescheidenheit*: 'Herzelieber friunde zorn / der wirt schiere verkorn' (65,6f.) and in other early collections of proverbial wisdom (TPMA IV (1997): 'Freund', nos. 233-37 and 709-17). In the sixteenth century, the poet and playwright Richard Edwards applied the proverb to a variety of relationships, including mother and child, in his poem *Amantium irae amoris redintegratio est*.

<sup>112</sup> See 3.3.2 below for the anger between Obie and Meljanz.

17). However, at a much earlier stage, as she considers whether she should abandon her *zorn* towards the killer of her husband Askalon, Laudine reaches the conclusion:

sô muoz er mich mit triuwen  
ergetzen mîner riuwen,  
und muoz mich deste baz hân  
daz er mir leide hât getân. (2069-72)

It is arguable that the subsequent course of events proves this to be false reasoning although, equally, it could be said that Laudine is here simply searching for excuses which will make her decision to wed her husband's killer seem reasonable. Either way, it seems that Hartmann has no use for the idea that lovers' quarrels strengthen their relationship.

In Wolfram's *Parzival*, there are two important scenes of reconciliation between lovers after a prolonged display of *zorn* by one party. The first instance is the reconciliation between Orilus and Jeschute after Parzival has sworn that Jeschute is innocent of any improper conduct (see 3.2.1.2 below). There is no direct suggestion here that anger has strengthened their relationship, but the narrator does comment:

ouch ist genuogen liuten kunt,  
weindiu ougn hânt süezen munt.  
dâ von ich mêr noch sprechen wil.  
grôz liebe ist freude und jâmers zil.  
swer von der liebe ir mære  
treit ûf den seigære,  
oberz immer wolde wegn,  
ez enkan niht anderr schanze pflegn. (272,11-18)<sup>114</sup>

The other great reconciliation scene is between Gawan and Orgeluse. Again, there is no direct suggestion that anger has strengthened their relationship, but there is a curious parallel between the words of Orgeluse and those of Erec (*Erec* 6781; 6785f.). She, too explains her display of anger as 'daz was durch ein versuochen' (*Pz.* 614,7) and continues:

dem golde ich iuch gelîche,  
daz man liutert in der gluot:  
als ist geliutert iwer muot. (*Pz.* 614,12-14)

<sup>113</sup> Contrast *Tristan* 13073, quoted above.

<sup>114</sup> This passage does not seem to have been adequately explained. Nellmann (1994, II: 601 on *Pz.* 272,12) cites Wolfram's *Tagelied* I, 3 (3,26: 'weindiu ougen — süezer vrouwen kus!') and refers to Latin and Old French parallels cited by Singer (1939: 37f.). In fact, these parallels consist of one Old French line (*Esclarmonde* 3743: 'Bouce salée plaisans est a baisier') and one line of Latin (from the *Arundel Lyrics*, attributed to Peter of Blois but preserved in a late-fourteenth-century hand: 'Delibuta lacrimis oscula plus sapiunt'). Singer actually says: 'Der einleitende Vers zeigt, dass es sich um ein Sprichwort handelt, kaum aber um ein deutsches.' *TPMA* I (1995): 'Auge', nos. 456-59, casts no further light on the question, since Wolfram is likely to have been the source of the other examples quoted. The subsequent image of love's unequal weights is found in the *De amore* of Andreas Capellanus (I.6,104).

The idea of anger as a test of love is one that is also found in the *De amore* of Andreas Capellanus:

Sed et simulatae indignationes quandoque pulchre inter amantes sibi locum possunt vindicare. Nam, si unus amantium alteri se ostendat iratum et ob aliquam causam se indignatum demonstrat amanti, eius manifeste poterit cognoscere fidem. Verus enim amans semper pavidus pertimescit ne perpetua sit indignatio coamantis, et ideo, licet quandoque indigno coamanti coamans se ostenderit indignatum, talis quidem modico tempore poterit durare commotio, si verus inter eos amor esse dignoscitur. Ex talibus quidem indignationibus dilectionis vinculum vel amoris non credas attenuari substantiam, sed exinde omnis in eo purificatur aerugo. (II.5,8f.)

In *Erec*, Hartmann appears to approve of this sentiment: the fact that Enite passes the test with flying colours seems to justify the procedure. In *Iwein*, he appears more ambivalent: although Iwein proves himself on the field of combat, it is left open whether the damage done to his relationship with Laudine can ever truly be repaired at the emotional level.

Wolfram seems to be altogether more sceptical. His sympathetic portrayal of Jeschute again invites the reader/audience to question the severity of her treatment:

nu sult ir si durch triwe klagn:  
si begint nu hôhen kumber tragn.  
wær mir aller wîbe haz bereit,  
mich müet doch froun Jeschûten leit. (137,27-30)

He does not question her husband's right to defend her (and his own) honour (*Pz.* 264,1-19), but it is clear that Orilus's anger has clouded his judgement and he himself says 'ich hân unfuoge an ir getân' (*Pz.* 271,7).<sup>115</sup>

The role-reversal between Gawan and Orgeluse, which is rich with allusions to Orilus's treatment of Jeschute, points this up even more succinctly (see 3.3.4.3.1 below). Orgeluse's anger not only leads to Gawan's public humiliation and near-death, it also brings the Grail Kingdom to its knees. Furthermore, it sets Gawan on a collision course with Gramoflanz that can only lead to further bloodshed and unhappiness.

### 1.7 The Social Uses and Significance of Anger

There is a temptation to regard displays of emotion as 'unambiguous signs of feelings', but this is not always the case in medieval literary representations of *zorn*, as will be seen.<sup>116</sup> On the one hand, anger is frequently a response to a challenge to one's honour, integrity or authority and sends out a clear social signal that the challenge will be

<sup>115</sup> *unfuoge* is directly associated with anger on several occasions in *Parzival* (see 3.2.5 and 3.3.5 below).

<sup>116</sup> White 1998 discusses how this view of the emotions shaped some critics' view of history (especially Marc Bloch's). See also Müller 1998: 203-08.



resisted (Althoff 1998; Barton 1998).<sup>117</sup> The extent to which this is accompanied by any true feelings is not only hard to discern at times, but often irrelevant. On the other hand, anger is also part of the armoury of the hero: *furor heroicus* is an essential component of battle, it expresses *Kampfbereitschaft*, the aggressive mind-set that propels a warrior on his path to death or glory (see 1.7.3 below).

Although anger was viewed as a sin and a vice, as already discussed, it was nevertheless possible for anger to be seen in a positive light where it served to uphold legitimate authority or led to the victory of Good over Evil. Medieval theologians distinguished between good and bad anger — *ira per zelum* and *ira per vitium* respectively — and viewed anger directed towards one's own sins or towards other sinners and their sins as inherently virtuous (Barton 1998: 156f.). According to Gregory the Great, good anger arose from an eagerness for justice, whilst culpable anger arose from impatience (Freedman 1998: 181). This had a firm basis in classical Greek thought (Freedman 1998: 172).

There was also a practical problem with the clerical insistence on *patientia* as the remedy for anger, particularly in relation to kingship. Although forbearance and humility were the clerical ideal for kings, submission to all manner of insults and injuries was incompatible with strong rulership (Althoff 1998: 61; Hyams 1998: 98-105). The twelfth century saw an increasing emphasis on just anger, without losing sight of the importance of *clementia* and other traditional royal virtues (Althoff 1998: 70-73). Thus in his *Policraticus*, John of Salisbury points to the prince's duty to apply justice without wrathfulness:

Hic siquidem gladius est columbae, quae sine felle rixatur, sine iracundia ferit, et, cum dimicat, nullam omnino concipit amaritudinem. Nam sicut lex culpas persequitur sine odio personarum, ita et princeps delinquentes rectissime punit, non aliquo iracundiae motu sed mansuetae legis arbitrio. (IV: 2,51-56)

Yet he also identifies circumstances where anger is justified:

Vtique qui a Deo potestatem accipit, legibus seruit et iustitiae et iuris famulus est. Qui uero eam usurpat, iura deprimit et uoluntati suae leges submittit. In eum ergo merito armantur iura qui leges exarmat, et publica potestas saevit in eum qui euacuare nititur publicam manum. Et cum multa sint crimina maiestatis, nullum grauius est eo quod adversus ipsum corpus iustitiae exercetur. (III: 15,15-21)

et magister caelestis hominem homini diligendum docuerit ut se ipsum. Vnde patet indignum esse tanto magistro discipulum qui ueritati non congaudet et adversus publicae salutis hostes non excandescit. (III: *prologus*, 20-23)

Sic et potestas, cum inferiorum uitia mansueta manu curare non sufficit, poenarum acrimoniam dolens recte uulneribus infundit, et pia crudelitate saeuat in malos, dum bonorum incolumitas procuratur. (IV: 8,12-16)

<sup>117</sup> Barton suggests that anger is used as a negotiating tool in these situations: I suspect that this is not always so.

In secular medieval literature, anger could be viewed positively if it was exercised appropriately by the Christian male nobility.<sup>118</sup> If women, peasants, heathens, or characters on the fringes of normal society (such as giants, dwarves, wild men, or fools) showed anger, this would generally turn out to be unjustified, immoderate, offensive, ineffectual, and/or ridiculous.<sup>119</sup>

Positive examples of anger being used in the defence of honour, authority and/or justice can be found in all the texts under consideration and a single example from each will be sufficient to illustrate the point at this stage.

In *Erec*, the hero's *zorn* is inflamed when the two giants treat Cadoc worse than before, specifically as a result of his intervention: 'an si truoc in der zorn' (5505). His anger is in response to what he perceives as injustice. The narrator has already commented that, in their treatment of Cadoc, the giants 'brâchen vaste ritters reht' (5412) and were treating him worse than a common thief. Erec also points out to the giants that, if Cadoc is of knightly status, they are taking their punishment of him too far (5466-72). The fact that Erec immediately kills one of the giants 'als ez der hövesche got gebôt' (5517), seems to imply that God is on Erec's side and, indeed, on the side of knighthood in general. It is one of the few instances where *zorn* appears to receive divine approval.

In *Iwein*, Artus is angered when, against his better judgement, he allows Meljaganz to demand whatever he wants and the latter asks for the queen (4530-607). In spite of his anger, which reflects a sense of betrayal by his counsellors (4590-92) but is also a reaction to an affront to the queen and the entire court (4611-21), Artus is constrained to agree to the request (4608f.). In this case, Artus has to moderate his response in order to preserve his reputation for *milte* (4539) and the sanctity of his word (4609). Nevertheless, Meljaganz is characterized by his request as 'ein vrävel man' (4585) and the attendant knights are not slow to pursue the matter.

In *Parzival*, when Obie sends a squire to ask Gawan whether his horses are for sale, the squire is received 'mit zorn' (360,18) and we are told 'Gâwâns ougen blicke / in lêrten herzen schricke' (360,19f.). The implication that Gawan might be a merchant is a slight on his honour: this is already clear from his reaction to the conversation between

<sup>118</sup> Note that different norms applied to other forms of literature, such as hagiography: female saints were just as capable as their male counterparts of showing righteous anger (Peyroux 1998).

<sup>119</sup> Exceptions could be made in the case of noble women, but only in very limited circumstances (see below).

Obie and Obilot (358,15-20). Gawan's anger therefore represents his rejection of the slight and also asserts his superiority over the squire.

The incompatibility of womanhood with anger is stated most clearly by Gottfried as he explains why Isolde is unable to kill Tristan as he sits defenceless in the bath:

an ir striten harte  
die zwô widerwarte,  
die widerwarten conterfeit  
zorn unde wîpheit,  
diu übele bî ein ander zement,  
swâ si sich ze handen nement.  
sô zorn an Îsolde  
den vînt slahen wolde,  
sô gie diu süeze wîpheit zuo. (*Tristan* 10257-65)<sup>120</sup>

Female anger is problematized in both *Iwein* and *Parzival*.<sup>121</sup> In *Iwein*, nearly all the principal female characters display anger at some point: Ginover, Lunete, Laudine, and the elder sister 'von dem Swarzen Dorne'. Here, female anger seems to have some value, where it has a corrective effect, but it is also shown to be foolish and to have a destructive effect on occasions (see 2.2 below). Meanwhile, in *Parzival*, the anger of Cundrie la Surziere, Obie and Orgeluse has to be specifically excused by the narrator. Thus Cundrie is 'ein magt gein triwen wol gelobt, / wan daz ir zuht was vertobt' (312,3f.) and she later begs Parzival to set aside his anger towards her (779,22-26). In Obie's case: 'Von minn noch zornes vil geschiht: / nune wîzetz Obîen niht' (366,1f.). Finally, the most spirited defence is mounted for Orgeluse (516,3-14) (see 3.2.3.2, 3.3.2 and 3.3.4.3 below).

It has been suggested that, from the thirteenth to the sixteenth century, writers 'imagined the anger of peasants in two fundamental ways: peasant anger was ludicrous with respect to individuals, and it was capable of instigating terrifying mass violence' (Freedman 1998: 171). This attitude seems to underlie descriptions of peasant anger, aggression and unrest in the texts under consideration here, although there is usually less overt criticism and derogatory comment in the German texts than in their French sources.

In *Parzival*, when Gawan is discovered in Antikonie's chamber, the 'bovel' (408,3) that assails him contains some knights and merchants (408,1), but makes so much noise that Antikonie cannot make herself heard (408,7f.), and the crowd is subsequently

<sup>120</sup> Krohn (trans.) 1990: III, 162 (on *Tristan* 10255) rightly draws attention to the inability in law of women in the Middle Ages to exercise *Blutrache*. Thus any claim that women might have to righteous anger is undermined by their inability to give vent to it legally.

<sup>121</sup> The almost complete lack of female anger in *Erec* is consonant with the generally idealized portrayal of women in that text (see Chapter 2.1).

characterized as ‘arge nâchgebûre’ (408,14), whilst Antikonie searches for weapons with which to fight ‘gein disem ungetriwen her’ (408,18). Nevertheless, it must be noted that, in *Parzival*, the crowd seems less obviously ignoble and certainly incurs no derogatory comments either from the narrator or from Antikonie, in contrast to the situation in *Perceval*. There is also not the same emphasis on anger that there is in the French text.

Characters outside normal courtly society, such as the wild man in *Iwein*, are routinely demonized and frequently angry in all three of the texts under consideration. Furthermore, giants and dwarves also tend to be associated with anger. This point has been noted in passing before, but there does not seem to have been much research on the origins of this association.<sup>122</sup>

### 1.7.1 *Furor Teutonicus*

It is a literary commonplace that the German race is particularly aggressive and given to anger (Arnold 1991: 40f.). In his *Germania*, written in AD 98, Tacitus describes the Germanic tribes’ frightening war cry (3.1) and their love of war (14). However, it is unlikely that this text was widely known before the Renaissance (Reynolds 1983: 410f.). A more likely source is Lucan’s *Bellum civile*, which survives in more than 400 MSS and was the subject of two ancient commentaries (Reynolds 1983: 215-18) and some medieval glosses. In Book I, Caesar addresses his troops, stating:

nos primi Senonum motus Cimbrumque ruentem  
vidimus et Martem Libyes cursumque furoris  
Teutonici: quotiens Romam fortuna lacessit,  
hac iter est bellis. (I,254-57)

<sup>122</sup> Habiger-Tuczay (1999: 635) notes how little has been published about dwarves and giants, especially those that appear in courtly literature. Harward (1958: 51-61) devotes a chapter to ‘The Truculent Dwarf and his Giant Kinsman’, but can shed no light on the origins of the tradition he describes. Similarly, Lecouteux (1982, I: 25f.) cites the description of the ‘gross und zornig’ giant in *Dietrichs erste Ausfahrt* (460,12-464,8) as ‘la meilleure description d’un géant que nous avons trouvée’, but makes no specific comment about the giant’s anger. Later (49) he makes the general observation that ‘la violence du géant s’exprime dans sa colère’. Habiger-Tuczay (1999: 654) states ‘Ein beliebtes Motiv ist der unbändige Zorn des Riesen, das die mittelhochdeutschen Dichter oft gestaltet haben’ and speculates (following Ahrendt) that there may be a connection between the portrayal of giants and the berserker tradition (see 1.7.3 below). I have found no other explanation for the anger of dwarves and giants. It seems to me, however, that anger characterizes these unusual individuals as non-courtly, even demonic. Habiger-Tuczay (645f.) makes passing reference to the biblical idea that giants resulted from the union of the sons of God with the daughters of man and, as such, were ‘die Verkörperung des Bösen’. She also refers to the giant’s *superbia* and to the importance of the combat between David and Goliath as a model for the medieval conception of giants. However, giants could also have positive associations (Christ and St Christopher, to name but two, were often portrayed as giants). It would therefore be necessary for hostile giants to be portrayed with negative attributes to emphasize their non-courtliness.

In the late twelfth century, the phrase ‘*cursumque furoris Teutonici*’ was glossed ‘*quia quasi furibundi cum impetu irati omnia incipiunt, unde Rome in rogacionibus dicitur: “a furore Teutonico libera nos Domine”*’ (Marti 1958: 40). This *furor* was sometimes remarked upon by the Germans themselves and seems to reflect a German predilection for conflict as a means of resolving disputes in the Middle Ages (Arnold 1991: 40f.). However, the alleged irascibility of the Germans may also be connected to their association with red hair (Tacitus, *Germania* 4) (see 1.2.4.1.1 above) or to the Nordic tradition of berserks (Kreutzer 1980; Cathey 1983), who could be considered extreme examples of exponents of *furor heroicus* (see 1.7.3 below).<sup>123</sup>

For the purposes of this thesis, the interest of the German association with anger lies in the fact that it is clearly something that has vexed both Germans and non-Germans from classical times onwards and it may begin to explain the literary interest in the topic that emerges from the three texts under consideration.

### 1.7.2 The Anger of Welshmen

When the young Parzival first encounters the three knights in the forest, the latter are annoyed to be delayed by ‘*dirre tœrsche Wâleise*’ (*Pz.* 121,5) and the narrator comments:

ein prîs den wir Beier tragn,  
muoz ich von Wâleisen sagn:  
die sint tœrscher denne beiersch her,  
unt doch bî manlîcher wer. (121,7-10)

Although the narrator refers only to the stupidity and bravery of the Welsh, they are in fact also renowned for their quarrelsomeness.<sup>124</sup> This is of some interest, in view of Parzival’s proclivity to anger (see Chapter 3 below). Thus, in his late-twelfth-century *De nugis curialium*, in a chapter entitled ‘*De furore Wallensium*’ (2,26), Walter Map tells a tale — ‘*Vt autem sciatis quam indiscreti et fatui furoris sint ire Walensium*’ — of

<sup>123</sup> Note also that Tacitus makes particular mention of the Germanic tribes’ war cry and of their habit of putting their shields to their mouths (*Germania* 3.1). Tacitus interprets the latter action as a deliberate attempt to reverberate the sound of the war cry, but it may be an early reference to berserks biting the edge of their shields. Benario (trans.) 1999: 67 comments: ‘how this reverberation could be produced from Germanic shields, which were not made of metal and were not half-cylindrical, is difficult to imagine’. Tacitus’s sources were primarily literary and it remains uncertain whether he ever went to Germany (Benario (trans.) 1999: 3f.).

<sup>124</sup> See Yeandle 1984: 123-25 on *Pz.* 121, 5: ‘there are good grounds for thinking *Wâleis* means Wales, and more particularly, South Wales’.

two Welshmen who eventually kill one another, and concludes by saying ‘Ecce quam stulta quamque iniusta est ira Walensium, et quam in sanguine<m> proni sunt’.<sup>125</sup>

There are also references to this aspect of the Welsh character in the works of Giraldus Cambrensis (ca. 1146-1223). For instance, in the *Itinerarium Kambriae*, we are told that Welsh irascibility extends to the degree that even Welsh saints are more vindictive than those of other nations: ‘sicut natio Hibernica, necnon et Kambrica, prae aliis gentibus praecipites in iram et ad vindictam in vita proni reperiuntur, sic et in morte vitali terrarum earundem sancti prae aliis animi vindicis esse videntur’ (II, 7: 103b).

### 1.7.3 *Furor heroicus*

It has often been noted that European literature, and epic in particular, begins with the wrath of Achilles (Fowler 1997: 17).<sup>126</sup> This kind of *furor heroicus* is an essential part of the hero’s make-up: it is what enables him to fight and win or die in the attempt (Henry 1982; Davies 1998: 196-98; Wright 1997: 178f.). It may be observed in the heroes of the great German epics of the High Middle Ages: *Rolandslied*, *Nibelungenlied* and Wolfram’s *Willehalm* (Pörksen 1971: 182, fn. 18). It is also displayed by the heroes of the three texts under consideration here and even by their adversaries: as a ‘stimulus to action’ and ‘survival mechanism’ (Wright 1997: 178f.). In appropriate measure it is not deprecated, often praiseworthy, and always essential.

The origins of *furor heroicus* do not seem to have been much studied and cannot be traced in detail here. It may well be deeply rooted in European mythology (Pörksen 1971: 182, fn. 18) and would appear to find extreme expression in the berserks of Nordic tradition (see 1.7.1 above).

<sup>125</sup> The final sentence is quoted by Yeandle (1984: 132f.) in his commentary on *Pz.* 121,9.

<sup>126</sup> *Mḗviv* (wrath) is the opening word of Homer’s *Iliad*.

## Chapter 2: The Arthurian Works of Hartmann von Aue

### 2.1 *Erec*

#### 2.1.1 Introduction

Hartmann von Aue's *Erec* is, as its modern title reflects, very much the story of its central protagonist. A comparison with its source, Chrétien de Troyes' *Erec et Enide*, reveals a shift from the story of a young couple to the biography of a hero (Kellermann 1973: 518). A corollary of this shift is an overriding concern from the very outset with the reputation or *êre* of the central character (Yeandle 2001: 100f.). This reputation is examined principally from three aspects: Erec's initial social status as a knight, his enhanced status as lord and king, and his fundamental status as a representative of the male sex. These interrelated aspects represent three vital facets of Erec's existence and, at the end of the work, we are presented with a hero who is apparently exemplary in all three.<sup>1</sup>

In spite of the change of focus, the relationship between Erec and Enite remains of fundamental importance to any interpretation of Hartmann's work, not least because this is the backdrop against which Erec's *êre* as husband and representative of the male sex is scrutinized. For this reason, the incidence of *zorn* in *Erec* will be examined first in the context of the relationship between Erec and Enite. Subsequent analysis of Erec's encounters with knightly and unknighly adversaries will then illuminate the relationship between *zorn* and knighthood and between *zorn* and lordship, but will also demonstrate how Erec's role within the marriage interacts with his role in society.<sup>2</sup>

#### 2.1.2 Erec and Enite

The marriage between Erec and Enite is not initially a love-match but is contracted as a means of restoring Erec's reputation (Wiegand 1972: 96). When the hero says to Koralus 'an iu stât gar mîn êre' (585), he refers to his dependence on his host both for arms and armour and for the hand of Enite. Both are essential prerequisites for

---

<sup>1</sup> The last lines of the poem (10032-135) are concerned primarily with Erec's exemplary reputation as a ruler (10035), in the pursuit of manly deeds (10037-42), and as husband (10119-23). Hartmann is careful to point out that Erec regards his *êre* as the gift of God (10085-88) and that the pursuit of worldly *êre* in this way is sufficient to gain the gift of eternal life for him and his wife (10124-29).

challenging Iders in the sparrowhawk contest and thus avenging the slight to Erec's honour. Love comes later.

Enite functions as an inspiration to knightly excellence, particularly in Erec's encounters with Iders (935-39) and with Mabonagrín (9230f.). She is thus indispensable to his knightly *êre*. However, she is also an object of desire, and not only for Erec, who turns all his thoughts to lovemaking after their return to Karnant (2928-30).<sup>3</sup> Both the unnamed Count, hereinafter referred to as Galoain, after his French counterpart, and Oringles are attracted by Enite's beauty (3668-74; 6178-83). The possession of such a beautiful wife is both a token of Erec's manly *êre* and an implicit threat to it.<sup>4</sup> The danger is twofold: on the one hand, there is the private, moral danger of submitting to the pleasures of marital life and neglecting the duties of knighthood and lordship. This seems to be the situation that develops at Karnant. On the other hand, outside the security of the home, such a beautiful woman attracts the unwelcome attention of other contenders for her affection, thus placing Erec in physical, public danger. This is the situation that develops as soon as Erec and Enite leave Karnant.

It is striking that in the relationship between husband and wife, *zorn* is associated almost exclusively with Erec.<sup>5</sup> It is also limited to the period between leaving Karnant and Erec's first encounter with Guivreiz.<sup>6</sup> The reasons for this will be discussed below.

---

<sup>2</sup> There are two instances where the phrase 'âne zorn lân' (1350; 4572) is simply used as a formula in order to seek to be excused from a social obligation and does not seem to merit further analysis (see 1.1.1 above). Similarly, Erec's entreaty to Gawein 'mînem herren und der kûnegîn / sult ir mînen dienesen sagen / und mich zornes übertragen' (4981-83) is a plea to be released from social obligation with no further implications for our understanding of *zorn*.

<sup>3</sup> Ruh (1977: 132) hits the nail on the head when he describes Enite's role in the first cycle of adventures as 'Lockvogel im besten *gewæte*'. However, it is also possible that Enite's splendid attire is a reaction against a more primitive Celtic version of the story, in which she was required to wear her worst dress as a symbol of suspected adultery (Hatto 1960).

<sup>4</sup> The positive and negative aspects of Enite's *schæne* are noted by Smits (1981: 22f.).

<sup>5</sup> In fact, the only instance in which *zorn* is associated with Enite occurs during her lament after Erec's apparent death (5774), see 2.1.3 below.

<sup>6</sup> Although Erec and Enite are not formally reconciled until after Oringles has been slain (6771-77), there is little evidence of continuing animosity between husband and wife after Guivreiz has been defeated. The matter is complicated somewhat by the poor state of preservation of the text at this point. Nevertheless, Enite is seen tending Erec's wounds (4506-08) and there is no mention of separate dining or sleeping arrangements at Guivreiz's castle. Enite plays no role at all in Erec's encounters with Keie and Gawein, re-emerging only to be received by Artus's court (5094-99). However, she is then separated from Erec and discusses her trials and tribulations with Ginover and the ladies of the court (5100-15). When Erec and Enite leave Artus, there is no mention of Enite up to the point where Erec asks her to dismount and wait for him (5306-8). As he collapses on his return and does not revive until Enite's 'wedding' with Oringles, there can be no further interaction between them until his recovery. It is as if the relationship between husband and wife ceases to be an issue once the halfway stage has been reached. Fisher (1975: 167, fn. 23) notes that Erec seems to abandon the 'Sprechverbot' during the first encounter with Guivreiz.



Although Hartmann is famously silent about Erec's motives in setting out with Enite, it is nevertheless clear that Erec's public *êre* has been completely wiped out by his behaviour in private:

Êrec wente sînen lîp  
grôzes gemaches durch sîn wîp.  
die minnete er sô sêre  
daz er aller êre  
durch si einen verphlac,  
unz daz er sich sô gar verlac  
daz niemen dehein ahte  
ûf in gehalten mahte. (2966-73)

Enite is quite explicitly perceived as the cause of Erec's downfall and is publicly cursed as such (2996-98). Erec's behaviour is not what is expected of a man — 'als er nie würde der man, / alsô vertreip er den tac' (2935f.)<sup>7</sup> — it seems that he is completely in thrall to his wife. The restoration of Erec's *êre* thus requires not only renewed proof of his knightly competence and fitness for lordship but also a re-assertion of his dominance within the marriage. Erec's treatment of Enite and his *zorn* towards her should thus be viewed in this light and not as an expression of his emotional state, as scholarship has sometimes assumed.<sup>8</sup> *Zorn* here represents a form of public behaviour that reinforces a power relationship: the power of husband over wife and, more generally, the husband's role as guardian of the couple's social and moral standing within the community of the time.<sup>9</sup> Erec's *zorn* is the outward expression of his authority as the dominant male, a role that he quite purposefully adopts for the *Aventiurefahrt* in order to re-assert his position within society.

When Erec overhears Enite's lament at Karnant (3029-33), he insists that she explain herself. We are never told exactly what she says to him, but Hartmann makes it clear that she anticipates being blamed for all sorts of things (3045f.) and she speaks

<sup>7</sup> For the significance of the phrase *ze man werden* and variants thereof, see Bumke 1977: 108.

<sup>8</sup> Perhaps the most obvious example is Fisher (1975: 162), who speaks of 'eine Periode der Desorientierung', which he compares to Iwein's madness, and (174) of Erec's immaturity. See (1991: 45) also speaks of Erec's 'mental disarray' and of his early behaviour as an 'immature, impulsive youth' (52). Blosen (1976 and 1978) and, following him, Campbell (1980), claim that Erec is guilty of jealousy and that this prompts his reaction to Enite's speech at Karnant. The opposite view, that there is a certain tactical aspect to Erec's behaviour, has already been put forward by Ruh (1977: 135) and Jones (2000: 304f.), whilst Carne (1970: 90 and 92) specifically points out that his *zorn* does not represent genuine antipathy towards Enite.

<sup>9</sup> For the social and political aspects of anger, see 1.7 above. For the contemporary view of the roles of husband and wife within marriage and in society at large, see Smits 1981: 17-19.

‘mit gedinge / daz er ir daz gehieze / daz erz âne zorn lieze’ (3047-49).<sup>10</sup> This remark is significant, as it prepares the audience for the possibility of Erec’s *zorn* and, indeed, indicates Enite’s own anticipation of it.

The situation is slightly different in *Erec et Enide*, for Chrétien makes special mention of the high esteem in which Enide is held and specifically states ‘ne nus de li ne mesdisoit’ (2426). What Enide hears is not talk of her malign influence on her husband’s career, but the suggestion ‘que recreant aloit ses sire / d’armes et de chevalerie’ (2462f.). Although there are suggestions that she has brought dishonour upon him (2501; 2555-61), it is clear that the court’s main criticisms are directed at Erec. In fact, Enide herself is somewhat aggrieved by the rumours (2465) such that, when Erec starts to question her, not only does she suggest that Erec must change his ways (2562-66), but he actually agrees with her and his critics (2572f.).<sup>11</sup> Hartmann, by contrast, makes no concession to critics of the hero.

A further important difference between the two texts lies in the manner of Erec’s departure. In *Erec et Enide*, Erec gives his father a full explanation of his plans (2712-14). Furthermore, he makes arrangements for half of the kingdom to be bestowed on Enide in her own right in the event of his death (2721-27). This is an act of empowerment without parallel in Hartmann’s version and strongly suggests that the French Erec never has any intention of repudiating his wife. By contrast, we are explicitly told that Hartmann’s Erec is bent on concealment (3069f.) and he subjects his wife to a ‘kumberlîche spæhe’ (3103) which is not lifted until their reconciliation (6771-80). This concealment extends beyond Erec’s bizarre preparations for departure to include his behaviour towards Enite throughout the whole of the so-called *Aventiurefahrt*.<sup>12</sup>

In both texts, Erec begins by ordering his wife to ride on ahead and to refrain from speaking unless spoken to (*EE*. 2764-71; *Erec* 3093-105). However, only in *Erec* is the

<sup>10</sup> The interpretation of ‘mit gedinge’ is not entirely unproblematic. Resler (trans.) 1987: 193 (Chap. V, fn. 3) seems to offer the most appropriate translation ‘in the hope that he would promise to relinquish the matter without ill-feelings’ (as opposed to ‘on condition that’), since there is no indication that Enite is in a position to impose any conditions. However, as will be seen, I take issue with his contention that Erec pursues a veritable vendetta against his wife.

<sup>11</sup> Erec’s question ‘De coi avez ire ne duel?’ (2513) points to *ire-douleur* (Kleiber 1978: 91, 99, 112 and 117). The verb *peser* (2465) is also associated with *douleur* (Kleiber 1978: 208-10).

order issued on pain of death.<sup>13</sup> As they journey through the forest, Enide and Enite repeatedly have to weigh up the risk of speaking against the consequences of remaining silent. Whilst they face the same problems and assess the risks in the same way, Hartmann seems to be especially concerned to characterize Erec's treatment of Enite as *zorn*, referring to it six times where Chrétien has Enide refer to Erec's potential anger only once.<sup>14</sup> It is also noticeable that Erec's *zorn* is associated with real or threatened punishment of Enite and is therefore the concomitant of the means by which Erec demonstrates his power over his wife. Thus the threat of death, the imposition of demeaning labour (the duties of a *kneht*) and the suspension of normal marital relations are all accompanied by specific references to Erec's *zorn*, as will be seen.

In *Erec et Enide*, when Enide becomes aware of the approach of the first three robbers and warns Erec about them, she is immediately reprimanded (2827-52). After the robbers have been defeated, she is again warned against speaking without permission and promises not to do so (2914-19). In *Erec*, because she has been warned not to speak on pain of death, Enite agonizes much longer over her decision and prays to God for guidance (3123-89). Erec does not take her to task until after he has disposed of the robbers (3235-58), but his criticisms are not specific to Enite. Instead Erec bemoans womankind's desire to do precisely that which is forbidden it.<sup>15</sup> Enite's defence is 'ich tetez durch mîne triuwe' (3262), which will become a recurrent theme of her response to Erec's *zorn*. Both Enide and Enite are required to deal with the three captured horses, but only in the German text is this specifically a punishment for

---

<sup>12</sup> It must remain doubtful whether it is really possible to sneak out wearing full armour under one's normal clothes without anyone noticing (3065f.). Furthermore, having drawn attention to the decrepit state of his helmet (3071-76), Erec then acts as if he is intending to attend a tournament (3080-83) before instructing the kitchen to be sure to have his dinner ready on his return (3088-92). All this would seem to reinforce the notion that things are not what they seem.

<sup>13</sup> Enide imagines that Erec may kill her (*EE*. 2977), but he never actually threatens her with death. It is possible to see in Erec's treatment of Enide/Enite a courtly rationalization of a Celtic *geis* upon speaking (Reinhard 1933: 153-55).

<sup>14</sup> See *Erec* 3416, 3437, 3956, 3969, 4162, 4263 and *EE*. 3729-34 (since Enide fears that Erec will abandon her, I consider it likely that (*se*) *corroucier* here refers to *ire-colère*. Kleiber 1978 does not appear to refer to this passage).

<sup>15</sup> Mieder (2001: 61) traces *Erec* 3242-48 to the proverbial wisdom 'Was man eim verbeut, das geliebt jhm am meisten' and *Erec* 3254-58 to 'Was man einem verbeut, das thut er am ersten'. However, the particular applicability to womankind would appear to derive from the biblical story of the Fall of Man, in which Eve eats the only fruit forbidden to her and persuades Adam to do likewise (Genesis 3.1-6). Smits (1981: 17-19) documents the ambivalent attitude of early and medieval Christianity towards women, whereby a growing recognition of the theoretical spiritual equality of men and women was accompanied by a persistent belief in women's physical, rational and moral inferiority. This attitude was undoubtedly shared by Hartmann.

speaking out (3270-76).<sup>16</sup> Furthermore, the references to Enite as a ‘kneht’ (3275, 3431, 3468) and ‘schiltkneht’ (3330) specifically recall Enite’s condition when she and Erec first met.<sup>17</sup>

The encounter with the second set of robbers follows broadly the same pattern. Again, Enide sees the robbers first and her warning is met with an immediate reprimand (*EE*. 2959-3006). Erec’s hostility is made explicit when he says ‘bien sachiez que ge vos an hé’ (3000). Once again, he reminds her to keep silent or face the consequences (3074-76). Meanwhile, in *Erec*, Enite once more prays to God for guidance before warning Erec (3351-83) and her defence yet again is her *triuwe*:

,genâde, herre!‘ sprach daz wîp.  
 ,ir sult mich des geniezen lân  
 daz ichz durch triuwe hân getân.  
 noch dulde ich baz iuwern zorn  
 dan iuwer lîp wære verlorn,  
 swaz mir nû von iu geschiht. (3413-18)

Erec this time justifies letting her live on the grounds that there is no honour to be had from killing a woman (3404-12).<sup>18</sup> However, he adds a new threat, not found in the French, as he puts Enite in charge of all eight captured horses:

und wirt ir einez verlorn,  
 ir müezet dulden den zorn  
 des ir gerne enbæret,  
 ob ir wîse wæret. (3436-39)

Departing from Chrétien, Hartmann also stresses the humility with which Enite accepts her lot:

si leit ez âne swære  
 mit senftem gemüete:  
 daz lërte si ir güete.  
 diu vrouwe grôzen kumber leit,  
 wan daz si ze liebe ir leit  
 in ir herzen verkêrte,  
 als si ir diemuot lërte. (3447-53)

<sup>16</sup> This is in line with the biblical notion of toil as one of the consequences of original sin and is a recurrent theme in medieval literature. Wolfram refers twice to Eve as the source of *ungemach* (*Pz.* 463,19-22) and *arbeit* (*Wh.* 218,1-30). It is interesting that Hartmann’s narrator refers to ‘dise ungelernet arbeit’ (*Erec* 3281), which emphasizes the biblical parallel, although we know that Enite performed the duties of a *kneht* before, albeit on a smaller scale, when Erec first arrived at her father’s house (317-22; 350-65).

<sup>17</sup> That is, ‘before the Fall’. See 2.1.5 below for other consequences of Enite’s apparent reversion to her pre-nuptial state. Enite’s reversion to her original status as *kneht* is noted by Cramer (1972: 106). See also Fisher (1975: 171), who somewhat idiosyncratically interprets Enite’s reversion in status to ‘eine Art geistiger Regression’ on the part of Erec.

<sup>18</sup> This is perhaps the first indication that Erec never had any serious intention of killing Enite whatever happened, for such an action could never have been honourable.

Whilst the forces of ‘vrou Sælde’ and ‘diu gotes hövescheit’ (3460f.) combine to prevent any harm from befalling Enite on account of the horses, she herself combats Erec’s anger with *güete* and *diemuot*, in addition to the *triuwe* already mentioned.<sup>19</sup> These qualities seem to function here as an antidote to *zorn*, perhaps reflecting the traditional idea of *patientia* as the antidote to *ira* (see 1.3.2 above).

Hartmann omits completely Enide’s all-night vigil and lament in the forest (*EE*. 3080-114), in which she blames herself for having cast doubt on Erec’s prowess. Thus he avoids any suggestion that Enite in any way doubts Erec. In the French text, Enide repeats her vigil at the inn, as she worries that Galoain will treacherously make a surprise attack, finally warning Erec near dawn of the impending danger (3437-79). The French Erec now sees that Enide is loyal to him (3480f.). Nevertheless, he still forbids her to speak to him (3510-13).

Hartmann stresses the fact that Erec does not want Enite to eat with him (3659-67) nor to sleep with him that night (3948-52), whereas in *Erec et Enide* the couple’s physical separation at table (3302f.) and in the bedroom (3432-35) is simply mentioned in passing. According to medieval law, separation of bed and board was a measure open to a husband who wished to repudiate his wife (Quast 1993: 163-66).<sup>20</sup> It is a very public expression of Erec’s authority within the marriage and is twice described by Hartmann as a manifestation of Erec’s *zorn*. First of all, the narrator expresses surprise, hinting at the will-power required for such action:

diz was iedoch ein wunder,  
daz er durch deheinen zorn  
im den muot hete erkorn  
daz er ein sô schœne wîp meit. (3955-58)

Subsequently, as Enite wonders ‘durch triuwe und durch güete’ (3961) how to break the news of Galoain’s treacherous intentions, the narrator comments:

[...] daz er ir durch den zorn  
ze geselleschefte niht phlac,  
wan er sunder âz und lac. (3969-71)<sup>21</sup>

<sup>19</sup> The horses also submit willingly to Enite’s control (3468-71), recalling the way in which Erec’s horse was willingly fed by her (364f.).

<sup>20</sup> The usual grounds for such action were adultery, but as Quast rightly points out, there is no suggestion of this in Enite’s case. I would also suggest that it is unnecessary to posit some other breach of trust, as Quast goes on to do. The point is that this action is at the absolute discretion of the husband, as Quast notes. This is neatly underlined by Erec’s reply when Galoain asks him the reason for his separation from Enite: ‘herre, mîn gemüete stât alsô’ (3745).

<sup>21</sup> By quite deliberately stressing the fact that separate eating and sleeping are the consequences of anger, Hartmann enhances the contrast between Erec and Oringles, who becomes enraged when Enite refuses to eat and sleep with him (see 2.1.5.2 below).

The Galoain episode leads to Enite breaking her vow of silence twice: once to warn Erec of the Count's treacherous plan and once to warn him of the approach of the Count and his men. This perhaps explains why Erec is now angrier than ever: 'sîn zorn wart grôz und ungemach / und unsenfter dan ê' (4263f.).<sup>22</sup> Nevertheless, this is the last point at which Erec's *zorn* towards Enite manifests itself.<sup>23</sup>

The evaporation of Erec's *zorn* seems to mark a turning point. Women's speech has emerged as something which can have both good and bad effects. On the one hand, it can provoke *zorn*, as in the verbal exchanges between Erec and Enite up to this point. On the other hand, in situations where Erec is quite oblivious of danger (3132f.; 3348; 3727-29), it can also raise the alarm and save life.<sup>24</sup> Twice Enite claims in her defence that Erec would have died if she had hesitated (3419f.; 4135f.). This claim is then endorsed by the narrator after Enite has warned Erec of Galoain's approach:

doch ez im solde wesen zorn,  
er hæte dicke verlorn  
von unbesihte den lîp,  
wan daz in warnte daz wîp. (4162-65)<sup>25</sup>

Ironically, by speaking out repeatedly in flagrant breach of Erec's instructions — in spite of the possible consequences — Enite has demonstrated her complete commitment to her husband. The inner monologues that accompany each decision to speak confirm that Enite's actions reflect an underlying attitude to her relationship with Erec that puts him first in all things, to the point that she is prepared to die for him.<sup>26</sup> The 'powerlessness relationship' (McConeghy 1987: 777) between husband and wife has

<sup>22</sup> This is in contrast to his French counterpart, whose admonitions to Enide to maintain silence do not square with his growing recognition of her fidelity, culminating in their exchange after she warns him of Guivret's approach: 'Ele li dit; il la menace; / mes n'a talant que mal li face, / qu'il aparçoit et conquist bien / qu'ele l'ainme sor tote rien, / et il li tant que plus ne puet' (EE. 3751-55).

<sup>23</sup> There seems to be a break in the narrative after l. 4317 — Cormeau/Gärtner (p. XV) speak of 'die Störung nach 4317' — but a missing reference to Erec's *zorn* seems unlikely, since Hartmann has hitherto had Erec deal with the danger first and reprimand his wife afterwards. Although it seems that Enite has warned Erec again of the impending danger, since the narrator comments 'dô wart im aber ir triuwe erkant' (4319), there is no sign of further animosity after Guivreiz has been defeated, as is also true in *Erec et Enide*.

<sup>24</sup> This brings to mind one of the *Disticha Catonis*: 'Uxoris linguam, si frugi est, ferre memento: / namque malum est, non velle pati nec posse tacere' (III,23), see 1.6.1 above.

<sup>25</sup> Line 4162 has been translated thus: 'und wenn er auch darüber zürnte' (Cramer (trans.) 1972); 'even though it made him angry' (Thomas (trans.) 1982, Keller (trans.) 1987 and Vivian (trans.) 2001); 'though this was a source of anger for Erec' (Resler (trans.) 1987). However, it is possible that 'solde' has deliberative force here, meaning 'although it should have made him angry'. If so, this would support my view of a divergence between thoughts and actions on Erec's part.

thus been publicly reaffirmed and it is no longer necessary for this issue to remain in the foreground.<sup>27</sup> That Erec fully appreciates his wife's devotion is clear from their brief conversation during his fight with Guivreiz. As Enite expresses the wish to take his place, fearing his death, Erec replies 'dâ verlür ich mêre an' (4431). Such a dutiful and subservient wife is to be cherished.<sup>28</sup>

The absence of Erec's *zorn* in the remainder of the *Aventiurefahrt* is not surprising, for the couple have little opportunity for interaction from the moment that Erec responds to the cry from Cadoc's lady until their reconciliation. Furthermore, there is no greater test that Erec himself can apply than the test of Enite's response in the face of his apparent death. The Oringles episode proves that Enite's attitude and actions are not influenced by Erec's physical presence but spring from a disposition that would endure even beyond his death. There is thus no question of Enite adopting a strategy to assuage Erec's *zorn*, as she does Galoain's (see 2.1.5.2 below), she is truly 'ein wîp unwandelbære' (6791).

In the reconciliation scene, Chrétien's Erec suggests that Enide has been put to the test, but also that he has forgiven her any wrongdoing (*EE*. 4883-93), whereas in *Erec* the reconciliation is relayed to us from the perspective of the narrator:

dô endete sich zestunt  
 diu swære spæhe  
 und diu vremde wæhe  
 der er unz an den tac  
 mit ir âne sache phlac,  
 daz er si mit gruoze meit  
 sît er mit ir von hûse reit.  
 durch daz diu spæhe wart genomen,  
 des ist er an ein ende komen  
 und westez rehte âne wân.  
 ez was durch versuochen getân  
 ob si im wære ein rehtez wîp.  
 nû hâte er ir lîp  
 ersichert genzlîchen wol,  
 als man daz golt sol  
 liutern in der esse,  
 daz er nû rehte wesse

<sup>26</sup> See *Erec* 3168-79; 3358-77; 3974-92. The first and last of these monologues focus on Erec's superior social status: he is 'edel unde rîch[e]' (3172, 3989), a figure on whom others beside herself depend — 'dâ verlür maneger an' (3171) — whilst she is 'ein als unklagebære wîp' (3169) and 'niht sô klagelîch' (3988). The second monologue essentially demonstrates Enite's recognition of the debt she owes Erec for elevating her to the status of queen.

<sup>27</sup> McConeghy's perceptive analysis of the implications of Enite's speech and silence has been of particular value to my analysis of Erec and Enite's relationship.

<sup>28</sup> Enite's devotion continues to be expressed in actions throughout the *Aventiurefahrt*. Thus she tends Erec's wounds (4505-08), guides him from Limors (6745-49) and saves him from death at the hands of Guivreiz (6939-56).

daz er an ir hæte  
 triuwe unde stæte  
 und daz si wære  
 ein wîp unwandelbære. (6771-91)

The idea of Erec's *zorn* being used as a test of Enite's worth is in keeping with the notion, preserved in the *De amore* of Andreas Capellanus, that anger may profitably be used to test the loyalty of a lover (see 1.6.4 above). The fact that Erec and Enite are husband and wife rather than lovers does not seem to preclude this, for when Oringles encounters Enite mourning Erec's apparent death and asks her 'was er iuwer âmîs ode iuwer man?', she replies 'beide, herre' (6172f.). Hartmann seems to be suggesting that love and marriage are not mutually exclusive and that Erec and Enite enjoy a relationship which has the potential to be both socially useful and personally fulfilling, and indeed this seems to be confirmed by the reconciliation scene and what follows (Schulze 1983: 36).<sup>29</sup>

The act of testing confirms the power of the tester over the tested and does not necessarily presuppose any failing on the part of the latter. Nevertheless, Erec's request for Enite's forgiveness (6795-99) acknowledges her suffering and suggests a degree of humility on his part. Thus it is unnecessary to look for any fault on Enite's part or to defend her against criticism.<sup>30</sup> The fact that Enite passes the test with flying colours is public proof of the inner virtue that accompanies her external beauty, thus refuting any suggestion that she could be a bad influence on her husband.<sup>31</sup> Indeed, Erec's honour and prestige are enhanced by such a model medieval wife.

<sup>29</sup> Schulze rightly notes the discrepancy between this fictional relationship and the reality for most noble couples at the time.

<sup>30</sup> The requirement for Enite to accompany Erec on the *Aventiurefahrt* has often been interpreted as a penance or punishment for some transgression on her part. This position has been adopted most stridently by Cramer (1972), who asserts that the marriage of Erec and Enite does not conform to the accepted feudal practices of the time. Thoran (1975), on the other hand, identifies failings in Enite's behaviour during the early stages of the relationship. Enite was, of course, most famously defended by Kuhn (1973) in the closing paragraphs of his seminal essay.

<sup>31</sup> The reference to Erec having tested Enite 'als man daz golt sol / liutern in der esse' (6785f.) recalls Proverbs 17.3: 'sicut igne probatur argentum et aurum camino ita corda probat Dominus' (Mieder 2001: 69f.). Whereas Mieder interprets this as referring to a successful test of both Erec and Enite (following Kuhn), the text refers only to Enite. Furthermore, the proverb cited by Mieder — 'Gold wird durch Feuer probiert, die Frau durch das Gold und der Mann durch die Frau' — does not seem particularly appropriate here, since during the *Aventiurefahrt* Enite is not tested by or tempted with worldly goods (gold), but rather the reverse, and it is not Erec but the opponents he meets who are tested by or tempted with female beauty. There are numerous biblical references to God refining souls like gold in the fire or in the furnace and a considerable body of proverbial wisdom seems to derive from this image (*TPMA* V (1997): 'Gold', nos. 66-137; Wander I (1867): 'Gold', no. 235). I would suggest that the analogy with God's power over the human soul underlines the husband's parallel power over his wife.



### 2.1.3 Enite's Lament

Enite's lament after Erec's apparent death is worthy of special attention, as it is the only instance in *Erec* where *zorn* is associated with Enite or indeed any female figure. Whereas Chrétien devotes 77 lines to Enide's lament, from the moment at which Erec tumbles from his horse to the moment when Oringles's men snatch the sword from her hand, Hartmann expands the equivalent passage by nearly five times to 379 lines. Hartmann, unlike his French predecessor, actually depicts Enite as being angry with God — 'vrouwe Ênîte zurnte vaste an got' (5774). Furthermore, in a long address to God which has no parallel in *Erec et Enide*, she contrasts God's 'wunderlîcher zorn' (5779) with his mercy and dwells on the nature of mercy (5775-841).

Hartmann's sources for his expansion of the lament seem to have been not only extracts from the Bible, such as the Book of Job, but also the Old French *Piramus et Tisbé* (Knapp 1976). It is possible that the latter provided the inspiration for Enite's anger.<sup>32</sup> However, this anger also links her both to Laudine in *Iwein* (*Iwein* 1381) and to Gregorius (*Gregorius* 2608). In Enite's case, as in the other two, it does not mark a turning away from God, but rather a point at which there is a danger of turning away.<sup>33</sup> In the Middle Ages, there was a traditional association between *ira* and the *desperatio* that leads to suicide (see 1.3.4 above).<sup>34</sup> Enite's anger therefore indicates her frustration and suicidal disposition.

Erec's apparent death appears to Enite as a strange manifestation of God's wrath:

si sprach: ,herre, ist diz dîn gebot  
daz ein ritter alsô guot  
durch sînen reinen muot  
sînen lîp hât verlorn,  
sô hât ein wunderlîcher zorn  
dîner gnâden erbarmunge genomen.' (5775-80)

*Zorn* here is in direct opposition to *genâde* and *erbarmunge*. However, in God's case, *zorn* does not seem to preclude the possibility of mercy. Indeed, Enite continues to have faith in his mercy and reasons that, since God really is supposed to be merciful (5781f.), he should now have mercy on her, and the urgency of her appeal is underlined by the

<sup>32</sup> Knapp 1976 does not specifically concern himself with Enite's anger. However, it is noticeable that both *Piramus* and *Tisbé* seem to be overcome by this emotion: the former when he wrongly believes that the bloody veil is a sign of his beloved's death, the latter when she beholds her beloved's body — see *Piramus et Tisbé* 700-07 and 778 (*Piramus*) and 830 (*Tisbé*). The author does not state that their anger is directed at God, but both address God before killing themselves.

<sup>33</sup> This becomes quite clear from Laudine's remarks (*Iwein* 1889-98), see Knapp 1979: 170.

number of references to God's mercy and/or his merciful nature.<sup>35</sup> Divine mercy is also linked to *güete* (5819), and thus a picture emerges in which *erbarme* and *güete*, qualities which will be seen to be closely associated with Erec himself and to function throughout *Erec* as antidotes or countermeasures to *zorn*, take on a divine aspect.

#### 2.1.4 Erec's Unknightly Opponents

At the beginning of both the first and second cycle of adventures after leaving Karnant, Erec encounters opponents who are distinctly unknightly. In the first cycle of adventures, he encounters first three, then five robbers, whilst in the second cycle he faces two giants.

In *Erec et Enide*, Erec's first opponents are robber-knights who are fully armed (2795) and who observe the rules of chivalry, at least to the extent of challenging Erec individually (2822-26).<sup>36</sup> The second set of robbers also comprises 'cinc chevalier' (2923). In Hartmann's *Erec* all eight are described as 'roubære' (3116; 3128; 3190; 3298).<sup>37</sup> Furthermore, they are poorly armed — 'nâch roubære rehte' (3229) — unlike their French counterparts. Thus Hartmann's Erec is able to dispose of all the robbers with very little fuss, his response to the first robber being typical:

Êrec durch sînen grimmen muot  
im dehein antwort enbôt  
und stach in von dem rosse tôt. (3221-23)

The reference to his 'grimmen muot' echoes the description of Erec during his fight with Iders and seems to represent the frame of mind necessary to deal with a life-and-death situation rather than anger.<sup>38</sup> Like Iders, the first robber indicates in advance of attack his intention to kill Erec (3219f.). This is in contrast to the situation in *Erec et Enide*, where no such threat is issued, although the possibility of a fatal outcome is weighed by Enide when she first spots the three robber-knights (2830f.). The French

---

<sup>34</sup> Okken (1993: 148 on 5774) refers to a passage from Seneca's *De ira*, in which *tristitia* is described as the companion of *iracundia*. However, it must remain doubtful whether Hartmann could have known this specific passage (see 1.4 above).

<sup>35</sup> Nine times in 67 lines (5775-841), viz. 5780, 5782, 5785, 5789, 5792, 5793, 5807, 5818, 5831.

<sup>36</sup> The first assailant is 'uns chevaliers [...], / qui de roberie vivoit' (2792f.). Enide refers to the first band as 'troi chevalier' (2843) and the first two assailants are subsequently referred to as 'chevalier' (2854 and 2879).

<sup>37</sup> Note, however that Enide refers to them as 'ritter' at 3186.

<sup>38</sup> Cramer (trans.) 1972 translates the first instance (858) as 'voller Grimm', which seems more appropriate than his translation of the second instance (3221) as 'in seinem Zorn'. Keller (trans.) 1987 translates this as 'in rage' and 'in his anger' respectively. Hartmann makes it quite explicit that Iders and Erec are both affected by 'diu grimme nôt' of fighting for their very lives (834-44). In fact, Hartmann reserves the use of the word *grim* and its derivatives almost exclusively for situations of life and death: this is particularly evident in the Joie de la Curt episode, as will be seen.

Erec strikes the first robber's shield 'de tel äir' (2862) that he splits it in two, but whereas Chrétien relies on the gory details of the fight for impact, Hartmann's succinct statement is also effective in conveying the hero's innate superiority over such opponents. Anger does not really play a part here.

This is not the case in Erec's encounter with the giants, however. Medieval giants are traditionally angry and the two that Erec meets do not disappoint in this respect.<sup>39</sup> Erec's attention is first attracted by 'eine stimme / jæmerlîchen grimme' (5296f.). Once again, the adjective *grimme* points to a potentially fatal encounter, for it is the voice of a woman made almost hoarse by 'diu bitter leides grimme' (5346) that she believes her companion, Cadoc, to be facing certain death (5350-53). We are told only that the giants have been hostile to Cadoc for some time (5359f.). Erec's initial attempts to find out the reason for the giants' maltreatment of Cadoc and to have Cadoc released are rebuffed:

dannoch wolde in Êrec  
mit güete überwunden hân  
daz er den ritter hæte lân.  
diu bete was vil gar verlorn,  
wan daz er reizete des risen zorn. (5489-93)

On this occasion, the application of *güete*, which elsewhere seems to function as an antidote to *zorn*, does not have the desired effect.<sup>40</sup> This seems to be further proof that the giants operate outside the norms of knightly ethics.<sup>41</sup> Their failure to respond to peaceful persuasion seems to legitimize Erec's use of force to compel Cadoc's release. Erec's own *zorn* is thus inflamed when the giants treat Cadoc worse than before, specifically as a result of his intervention: 'an si truoc in der zorn' (5505). His anger is in response to what he perceives as injustice. The narrator has already commented that, in their treatment of Cadoc, the giants 'brâchen vaste ritters reht' (5412) and were treating him worse than a common thief. Erec also points out to the giants that, if Cadoc is of knightly status, they are taking their punishment of him too far (5466-72). The fact that Erec immediately kills one of the giants 'als ez der hövesche got gebôt' (5517),

<sup>39</sup> For the connection between giants and anger, see 1.7 above.

<sup>40</sup> As has already been seen, *güete* characterizes Enite's response to Erec's *zorn*. It also plays an important part in Enite's handling of Galoain's *zorn* (see 2.1.5.2 below) and in Gawein's reaction to Erec's *zorn* (see 2.1.5.4 below). In all these instances, it has the effect of stemming violent action, whereas here the giants actually redouble their violence. The other exception is Keie's pretence of good intentions, which Erec sees through (see 2.1.5.4).

<sup>41</sup> Jackson (1994: 109-16) makes a number of pertinent comments on this episode. In particular, he notes (115f.) that Hartmann 'brings broader ethical and even religious considerations to the fore', and also comments on 'a sense of divine guidance, or trust in God's will, in Erec's actions and thoughts in the later stages of the narrative'.

seems to imply that God is on Erec's side and, indeed, on the side of knighthood in general. It is one of the few instances where *zorn* appears to receive divine approval.

The second giant responds to the death of his companion in stereotypically angry fashion (5521-28) and, even after Erec has cut off his leg — a traditional feature of the medieval giant-fight (Habiger-Tuczay 1999: 654f.), he continues to deal out 'manegen grimmen slac' (5558).<sup>42</sup> It is only with the help of God — who helped David overcome Goliath (5559-68) — that Erec is finally able to triumph. Thus, once again, Erec's response is vindicated.

In *Erec et Enide*, anger plays a lesser part. The giants are Cadoc's 'anemi mortel' (4318) and are planning his ignominious death (4324), but they are completely in the wrong (4323).<sup>43</sup> Cadoc's lady prays that God will give Erec the strength to defeat 'ces qui vers son ami ont ire' (4352),<sup>44</sup> but Chrétien does not portray God as being actively engaged in this matter. Although Erec enquires after the reason for Cadoc's punishment, there is no suggestion that the giants redouble their maltreatment of Cadoc as a result, nor that Erec is overcome by anger. He simply admits that the giants' actions bother him — 'Por voir m'an poise' (4395) — and responds to their invitation to take up Cadoc's cause. When the second giant sees that his companion has been killed, he is seized by anger (4425),<sup>45</sup> but this is the sole reference to the giants' disposition during their encounter with Erec.

It seems, therefore that Hartmann is at pains to portray the giants' behaviour in an even more unfavourable light than Chrétien does, making more use of stereotypical features<sup>46</sup> and making them much more impolite in their response to Erec.<sup>47</sup> Their behaviour justifies Erec's angry response and he is seen to react with righteous anger (see 1.6.2 and 1.7 above).<sup>48</sup>

<sup>42</sup> Note the use of the verb *wüeten* (5528) in the context of combat (see 1.1.3 above and fn. 53 below).

<sup>43</sup> Significantly, in *Erec* neither the narrator nor Cadoc's lady make any specific claims for his innocence, making the giants' behaviour the sole reason for Erec's *zorn*.

<sup>44</sup> *ire-colère* (Kleiber 1978: 277).

<sup>45</sup> *ire-colère* (Kleiber 1978: 363).

<sup>46</sup> Habiger Tuczay (1999: 650) states that this scene 'zeichnet die Riesen mit wesentlich archaischeren Zügen'.

<sup>47</sup> It is noticeable, for instance, that in *Erec*, the first giant addresses Erec with the familiar 'dû' (5448-56; 5477-86), despite Erec's consistent use of the polite 'ir' form when addressing him (5436-45; 5457-75). In *Erec et Enide*, the giant uses the polite form of address (4391-94; 4402-06) and talks much less. Hartmann's giant consequently has more scope to be insulting, calling Erec a 'rehter affe' (5452) and suggesting that he could wring Erec's neck like a chicken, if only it were worth his while (5481-83).

<sup>48</sup> Okken (1993: 142f. on 5288-599) comments: 'Die Episode liest sich wie ein Exempel auf manche Spruchweisheit Salomos', and he cites Proverbs 11.5, 13.6 and 10.28.

## 2.1.5 Erec's Knightly Opponents

### 2.1.5.1 Iders

The opening episode of Hartmann's *Erec* focuses sharply on the importance of controlling one's anger. Erec's initial offer to establish the identity of the passing knight is rebuffed by the Queen (21f.), who sends one of her ladies-in-waiting instead. Nevertheless, when this maiden is struck with a scourge by the dwarf riding ahead of the knight, Erec renews his offer in response to the Queen's complaint and this time his offer is accepted. When he fares no better than the maiden, we are told:

ouch wolde er sich gerochen hân,  
wan daz er wîslîchen  
sînem zorne kunde entwîchen.  
der ritter hete im genomen den lîp,  
wan Êrec was blôz als ein wîp. (99-103)<sup>49</sup>

In Chrétien's *Erec et Enide*, the importance of controlling one's anger is not stressed in the same way.<sup>50</sup> Instead, the emphasis is on Erec's fear of being killed (229) and in this context, the narrator cites a proverb: 'Folie n'est pas vaselages' (231).<sup>51</sup> Both the narrator and Erec himself are anxious to justify this fear: the former stressing the wisdom of Erec's reaction (232), the latter his powerlessness in the face of a well-armed and obviously unscrupulous opponent (238-43).

In *Erec et Enide*, Erec's anger is ignited only during the break in the sparrowhawk contest. He is at first fortified by the sight of Enide (907-12) and then recalls events in the forest, with the result that 'Ses mautalanz li renovele; / le chevalier par ire apele' (921f.).<sup>52</sup> It is clear that the sight of Enide gives Erec strength, whilst anger at the memory of the insult provides the motivation to win. This motivation is sufficiently strong that Erec is inclined to kill Yder until the latter begs for mercy (985-88).

<sup>49</sup> It seems reasonable to assume that 'sînem zorne' (101) refers to Erec's own feelings rather than those of the passing knight. The translations of Cramer (1972), Keller (1987), Resler (1987) and Vivian (2001) support this view.

<sup>50</sup> Curiously, however, the sentiment is found at a later point in the narrative in *Erex saga*, the Scandinavian prose version of the story, but this time applied to the Queen. When Malpirant surrenders to her, the Queen points out that he is undeserving of mercy but nevertheless accepts him into the court, stating: 'Conquering one's own anger and helping miserable wretches in need is the greatest victory' (Blaisdell and Kalinke (trans.) 1977: 10f.). One wonders whether the Old Norse translator was influenced by the French narrator's comment about the Queen 'molt est dolante et correciee' (194), recalled when Keu asks the Queen 's'il vos remanbre / del nain qui hier vos correça' (1110f.). Kleiber 1978 does not appear to deal with either of these lines, but the formula 'dolante et correciee' seems to point to *ire-douleur*.

<sup>51</sup> See *TPMA* VIII (1999): 'Narr', nos. 4-17. Wolf (1977: 263) suggests that there is a link here to the *chanson de geste* genre, since the proverb is cited in the *Chanson de Roland*.

<sup>52</sup> *ire-colère* (Kleiber 1978: 271 and 288).

In Hartmann's *Erec*, the situation is rather different. From the very beginning of the sparrowhawk contest, both combatants are seized with *furor heroicus* (see 1.7.3 above) in identical measure: 'si ruorte beide ein grôzer zorn' (760). Although particular mention is subsequently made of Erec — he grasps his sword with both hands 'mit grimmen muote / und vaht sam er wuote' (858f.), by the time Iders suggests a break, they are both exhausted:

nû hâten si sich alsô gar  
erwüetet und ervohten  
daz si niht mêre mohten. (891-93)<sup>53</sup>

There is no suggestion that Erec's *furor heroicus* is in any way connected to the original insult. Indeed, Erec does not think of the insult at all until the contest is once again under way. Now it is clear that the memory of the insult, followed by the sight of Enite, simply gives Erec sufficient strength to deliver the decisive blows (*Erec* 930-39) (Wetzlmair 1997: 56). As soon as Iders lies defeated, the narrator says of Erec 'sînen geiselstreich er rach' (950), signalling that the matter is closed. Whereas the memory of the insult specifically motivates Chrétien's Erec to want to kill Yder, Hartmann's Erec indulges in pure theatre:

als erm den helm abe brach,  
dô lôste erm ouch daz hûetelîn  
als er solde erslagen sîn,  
wan daz er des geruochte  
daz er genâde suochte. (951-55)

The gesture of removing a defeated opponent's helmet and coif is an unmistakable signal of intention to kill (Peil 1975: 155). Nevertheless, the conditional construction of l. 953 suggests that this is not Erec's true intention at all.<sup>54</sup> It seems that Erec is intent on teaching Iders a lesson, for only in Hartmann's version of the story does Iders state quite clearly that Erec can expect no mercy from him (715-20). Erec's address to his defeated opponent specifically refers back to this and, when he finally agrees to spare Iders, Erec states 'nû wil ich iuch leben lân: / des enhetet ir mir niht getân' (1012f.).

A similar situation arises after Erec has drawn Iders's attention to the insult meted out by the dwarf and, in another departure from Chrétien's story, declared his intention to exact retribution by severing the dwarf's hand (1045-55). Here, however, Hartmann is absolutely explicit about Erec's intentions:

daz enhâte doch der guote

<sup>53</sup> The verbs *wüeten* (859) and *erwüeten* (892) are used only in combat contexts in *Erec* (see 1.1.3 above) and seem to express the rage of *furor heroicus*. The other occurrence is at *Erec* 5528 (see fn. 42 above).

<sup>54</sup> These problematic lines have been discussed in more detail by Jones (1996: 81).

niht in sînem muote  
daz er alsô tuon solde,  
wan daz er gerne wolde  
daz getwerc warnen dâ mite. (1056-60)

These are early examples of a facility for dissimulation that Hartmann's Erec seems to possess from the very beginning.<sup>55</sup> It is a facility that distinguishes him from his French counterpart and enables him to appear to give vent to his anger by making as if to execute Iders and threatening to sever the dwarf's hand, whilst all the time remaining in control of events and of this most dangerous emotion. Erec's controlled use of anger here foreshadows his subsequent behaviour towards Enite.

#### 2.1.5.2 Galoain and Oringles

There is a sense in which all the individual knights that Erec encounters offer points of comparison and contrast to Erec himself.<sup>56</sup> Thus Iders first appears as the model of a fully armed knight (16f.), at a point where Erec is unarmed. Cadoc, on the other hand, is 'blôz sam ein hant' (5401), while Erec had previously been 'blôz als ein wîp' (103). Just as Erec had been struck by the dwarf with a scourge (97), Cadoc is scourged by the giants (5394-99).<sup>57</sup> However, the characters Galoain and Oringles, whom Erec encounters in his first and second cycle of adventures respectively, are of particular interest in relation to the theme of *zorn*.<sup>58</sup>

The parallels between Hartmann's Erec and the unnamed count, whom Chrétien calls Galoain, are particularly closely drawn.<sup>59</sup> Hartmann pinpoints the moment of Erec's decline from knightly perfection quite precisely:

Êrec was biderbe unde guot,  
ritterlîche stuont sîn muot  
ê er wîp genæme  
und hin heim kæme. (2924-27)

<sup>55</sup> Other examples of Erec's dissimulation have been elucidated by Jones (1994 and 2000).

<sup>56</sup> Guivreiz and Mabonagrî are discussed separately at 2.1.5.3 and 2.1.5.5 below.

<sup>57</sup> Cadoc's situation is, however, more extreme than Erec's: he is naked, rather than simply unarmed; his antagonists are of large stature, rather than small; he is outnumbered by two to one.

<sup>58</sup> Connections between Galoain, Oringles and Erec have been noted by Jackson (1994: 119), who points out that these 'figures of established lordship' (117) are precisely the men who covet Enite and thus illustrate the way in which the issues of lordship and marriage overlap. Since both Galoain and Oringles consider Erec to be of inferior status — Galoain as a result of Enite's fabrication (3865-80) and Oringles as a result of his own delusions of grandeur (6403f.), there is no question of political or territorial gain associated with their marriage plans. Both seem bent on sexual gratification — in Oringles's case, the narrator makes this explicit (6352-56). Nevertheless, a wife is essential for the production of legitimate heirs and Oringles's marriage plan is actually approved by his men (6186-211).

<sup>59</sup> The same parallels cannot be traced in *Erec and Enide*. Although we are later told 'chevaliers estoit forz et buens' (3581), the earlier references to Galoain as 'bricon' (3411), 'cuens de male part' (3424) and 'plains [...] de felenie' (3441) militate against an association with Erec.

It is at this point that Erec devotes himself entirely to *minne* and *gemach* (2927-33), leading to the crisis that propels him to leave Karnant. Just like Erec, Galoain is also ‘biderbe unde guot’ (3688) until ‘diu kreftige minne’ (3692) robs him of his senses and moves him to plot Enite’s abduction (Margetts 1997: 19).<sup>60</sup> Hartmann’s description of Galoain’s intentions lays stress on the unknighly and illegitimate aspects, as well as on the power of love (3668-721). Just as Erec professed to be undaunted by Koralus’s *armuot* (576-79), so Galoain reassures Enite ‘iuwer grôze armuot / die verwîze ich iu durch übel niht’ (3765f.). By making Enite take care of the horses he has won from the robbers, Erec has returned her to the state in which he found her.<sup>61</sup> Thus, when Galoain first speaks to Enite, he is offering to rescue her from *armuot* and the duties of a *schiltkneht* in much the same way as Erec effectively did when he proposed marriage (3753-96).<sup>62</sup> The difference lies in the fact that Erec’s motives were honourable, whereas Galoain’s are not. Furthermore, Galoain’s plans are destined to be thwarted, whereas Erec was able to realize his design.

When Enite initially rejects the notion of becoming his wife, Galoain declares his intention to take her by force (3830-37).<sup>63</sup> He requires Enite to co-operate ‘güetlîchen’ (3830), prompting her to prove herself the equal of her husband in dissimulation. She appears to go along with his idea — ‘vil güetlîchen sach si in an’ (3840) — and laughs ‘durch schœnen list’ (3842) in an effort to deflect Galoain from losing his temper (‘herre, zürnet ir niht’: 3844).<sup>64</sup> Whereas Erec’s attempts to reason with the first giant — ‘dannoch wolde in Êrec / mit güete überwunden hân’ (5489f.) — succeeded only in

<sup>60</sup> Wetzlmair (1997: 110) notes that Enite is also described as ‘biderbe unde guot’ (3003). Erec also addresses Guivreiz as ‘ritter biderbe unde guot’ (4350).

<sup>61</sup> When Enite is first commanded by her father to look after Erec’s horse, the narrator comments that no one ever had ‘süezern schiltkneht’ (361). As soon as Enite has been put in charge of the first three robbers’ horses, the first of the band of five robbers describes how Erec has a ‘seltsænen schiltkneht’ (3330). Both Erec and Galoain describe Enite’s role as that of a *kneht* (3431; 3773).

<sup>62</sup> The circumstances in which Chrétien’s Galoain first meets Enide are different: she and Erec are already esconced at the inn. He therefore does not even know that she has been looking after the horses and, consequently, does not refer to this. Verbal reminiscences of Enide’s earlier poverty are also absent — Galoain speaks instead of her current ‘viltance’ (3309).

<sup>63</sup> The situation is broadly similar in *Erec et Enide*, but less is made of Enide’s subterfuge: we are simply told ‘Ce panse cuers que ne dit boche’ (3376). Enide improvises a strategy to save Erec (3407-13), but there is no clear focus on a strategy for dealing with anger, although she obviously needs to calm Galoain’s mood (3356).

<sup>64</sup> Compare Erec’s conversation with Cadoc, in which he speaks ‘durch schœnen list’ (5664). The intention in both cases is to deceive (hence ‘list’), but to a good end (hence ‘schœne’). See Jones 2000.



further arousing the giant's anger, here *güete* is seen to function as an antidote to *zorn*.<sup>65</sup> The calming effect on *zorn* of *güete*, and the possession of *güete* strictly by the righteous, are themes that recur throughout Hartmann's *Erec*, as will be seen.

Nevertheless, Galoain's anger can be contained only as long as he thinks he is getting his own way. The next morning, he seems to have a premonition that his plans have failed and arrives in a state of high agitation at the inn where Erec and Enite stayed, kicking in the door (4044-48).<sup>66</sup> His state of mind is confirmed when he speaks to the innkeeper 'mit zornigen siten' (4061), refusing to accept that Erec and Enite have fled. It is in this scene, which is without precedent in *Erec et Enide*, that the contrast between Galoain and Erec is most acute. Galoain's perception that he has lost Enite 'durch gemach' (4090) recalls the way in which Erec surrendered himself completely to *gemach* at Karnant (2966f.). Indeed his words of self-reproach would not be out of place on the lips of Erec himself (Mieder 2001: 62):

... ,swer sîne sache  
wendet gar ze gemache,  
als ich hînaht hân getân,  
dem sol êre abe gân  
unde schande sîn bereit.  
wer gewan ie vrûmen âne arbeit? (4096-101)

Galoain's response to this situation is one of *zorn*. This is also comparable to Erec's reaction (see 2.1.2 above). However, Galoain's anger is different in nature, since it is uncontrolled: he and his men are in such a hurry to chase after Erec that they grab only their shields and spears and are therefore not in full armour (4107-09).<sup>67</sup> It is Enite who hears them approaching 'mit zornigem muote' (4140),<sup>68</sup> and Hartmann's detailed explanation of the need for her intervention — Erec's powers of perception are impeded by his armour (4150-65) — lends emphasis to the fact that Erec is in a full suit of armour, whilst Galoain is 'underm schilte bar' (4213).<sup>69</sup>

Galoain speaks to Erec in a manner described as 'vil unritterlîch' (4169) and 'mit ungezæmen grimme' (4170), the use of the latter phrase once again signalling a life-

<sup>65</sup> The parallels between the Galoain episode and Erec's arrival in Tulmein become even clearer at this point, as Enite pretends to have interpreted Galoain's initial approach as 'schimph' (3847) and 'spot' (3891), just as Koralus actually interpreted Erec's initial approach ('spot': 532; 'schimph': 546, 559).

<sup>66</sup> See 1.2.1 and 1.2.2 for general agitation and violence as symptoms of anger.

<sup>67</sup> See 1.3.3 for *impatientia* as one of the attributes of *Ira* in Prudentius's *Psychomachia*. See also 1.7 for Gregory the Great's notion that culpable anger arises from impatience.

<sup>68</sup> The description of the pursuers is broadly similar at this point in *Erec et Enide*: 'De mautalant tuit aïré' (3532).

and-death contest, for Galoain will not allow Erec to live unless he is willing to surrender Enite without a fight (4177-96).<sup>70</sup> The two men ride at each other ‘mit zorne’ (4207), signalling *furor heroicus*, but it is Galoain who is last seen being stretchered off with his men in disarray, six being killed by Erec and the others fleeing spontaneously. This is in marked contrast to Chrétien’s Galoain, who sees the error of his ways, restrains his men from further action and is said to be destined for a long life (*EE*. 3622-51).<sup>71</sup> It is little wonder that Hartmann declined to name this character, whose subsequent fate we are left to speculate on.

Points of comparison and contrast between Oringles and Galoain and between Oringles and Erec are also immediately obvious (Wetzlmair 1997: 83f.; Cramer 1972: 107; Fisher 1975: 165f.). Just as Galoain is described as ‘des landes herre, / ein rîcher grâve’ (3479f.), Oringles is ‘ein edel herre, / ein grâve’ (6118f.) and ‘der rîche man’ (6121).<sup>72</sup> Galoain rides out to greet Erec and Enite after being told that Enite is the most beautiful woman ever seen (3620-22) and he subsequently cannot get her out of his mind ‘als in der vrouwen schœne twanc’ (3673). Oringles is likewise immediately struck by Enite’s beauty (6160-66; 6178-83) and motivated by this to propose marriage. Like Galoain before him, Oringles professes to be rescuing Enite from *armuot*: ‘sich wandelt iuwer armuot / benamen hie in michel guot’ (6262f.), but Enite interprets his proposal of marriage, like that of Galoain, as ‘spot’ (6288).<sup>73</sup>

As in the case of Galoain, Oringles is able to maintain his composure as long as things seem to be going his way. However, his impatience to marry Enite finally drives him to lose his temper when she will not cease mourning for Erec. His final attempt at peaceful persuasion is a rhetorical *tour de force* (6471-94).<sup>74</sup> However, his speech is laden with irony, for Oringles knows nothing of Enite’s past and assesses her circumstances purely at first sight. The temporal conjunctions ‘ê’, ‘nû’ and ‘vor’, given

---

<sup>69</sup> Here again there is a contrast between Galoain and Erec. Whilst Erec pursued Iders without armour in great haste, in order not to lose his trail, he nevertheless maintained a safe distance and waited for an opportunity to engage Iders on roughly equal terms (160-69).

<sup>70</sup> See 1.2.1 for a loud or angry voice as a symptom of anger.

<sup>71</sup> Roques (1981: 224) argues that apparently contradictory readings in MSS A and R for *EE*. 3651 may nevertheless both imply a long life.

<sup>72</sup> In *Erec et Enide*, Galoain is portrayed as extremely vain (3223-46), but this aspect of his character is completely suppressed by Hartmann. Chrétien describes him simply as ‘le conte Caloain’ (after 3122, Roques 1981: 222), whereas Oringles is initially ‘un conte o grant chevalerie’ (4639), but the similarities between these two characters begin and end with their rank.

<sup>73</sup> As noted above in respect of Galoain, Hartmann thus also creates parallels with Erec.

added prominence by anaphora, have a quite different significance for Oringles to the significance they have for Enite and for the reader/audience. Whilst Oringles contrasts Enite's apparent position as an isolated and unprotected widow with the advantages of marriage to himself, Enite and the audience/reader inevitably contrast Oringles with Erec.

The irony of the situation is further underlined by the suspicion of the audience/reader, not obvious to Enite, that Erec is not dead at all.<sup>75</sup> Unlike his French counterpart, the German Oringles actually boasts of his superiority to Erec: 'ich bin vil wol sîn übergênôz / oder doch wol als vrum als er' (6403f.). The French Oringles, on the other hand, has little time for persuasion and resorts quickly to threats: Enide must forget her grief (4768), as he warns her 'gardez vos de moi correcier' (4774).<sup>76</sup> In *Erec*, Oringles's anger is perhaps more shocking because he does not warn Enite in this way. In both texts, the count is moved to strike Enide/Enite because she refuses to eat until her apparently dead husband eats (*EE*. 4777-80; *Erec* 6513f.), and in both cases, this action is condemned by the count's men (*EE*. 4789-98; *Erec* 6525-33). However, in *Erec* the narrator also condemns it:

nû enmohte der grâve mê  
im selben meister sîn,  
er entæte sîn untugent schîn:  
sîn zorn in verleite  
ze grôzer tôrheite. (6515-19)

The count's loss of control and explosion of anger are identified as *untugent* and *tôrheit*. The general criticism of his action only seems to make matters worse, for we are told that 'der schalchafte man / vil sêre zürnen began' (6536f.), he suffers 'ungemach' (6538), and addresses his men 'vil unsenfteclîche' (6539).<sup>77</sup> His subsequent assertion of a man's right to do as he pleases with his wife (6540-48) would have been in keeping with late-twelfth-century views on marriage and has its counterpart in *Erec et Enide*

<sup>74</sup> The element of peaceful persuasion is missing from *Erec et Enide*, where Oringles simply announces to Enide his intention to marry her (4655-71). The effect in *Erec* is to increase the impact of Oringles's eventual loss of patience.

<sup>75</sup> Hartmann's description of Erec as 'der halptôte man' (5730) and 'er lac vür tôt' (5738) point to his future recovery, but to Enite he appears dead. The situation is essentially the same in *Erec et Enide*.

<sup>76</sup> The reference to 'duel et ire' at *EE*. 4768 is clearly to *ire-douleur* (Kleiber 1978: 94 and 112). Kleiber 1978 does not appear to deal with *EE*. 4774, but it would seem to be a warning against incurring Oringles's wrath.

<sup>77</sup> The term *schalchaft* can have demonic associations (Dittrich 1966: 456f.) and is perhaps not inappropriate for the Count of Limors, a title with otherworldly associations. The count's angry demeanour would be in keeping with a demonic image (see 1.5.2.3 above).

(4799-801).<sup>78</sup> Nevertheless, it also invites comparison between Oringles's brutality and Erec's treatment of Enite (see 2.1.2 above).

When Erec is eventually awakened by Enite's cries and recognizes her voice, he leaps to his feet 'mit grimme' (6615). It is Erec's turn to be angry now — 'er hâte zornes genuoc' (6620) — and he kills Oringles and the two men nearest to him without further ado. The scene is similar in *Erec et Enide*, and here, too, Erec is inflamed by anger — 'ire li done hardemant' (4824), but whereas in the French text, the populace of Limors 'tuit cuident que ce soit deables / qui leanz soit entr'ax venuz' (4832f.), in *Erec* the hero has the attributes of a man risen from the dead, with bloody wounds and bandages (6669-73).<sup>79</sup> The description of him running around with drawn sword is at once both comic and alarming (6674-81). The effect is to confirm Erec's anger as righteous, particularly in comparison to that of Oringles.

In Galoain and Oringles, Enite is effectively presented with two alternative husbands to Erec, both attracted by her beauty and both inclined to get their own way by force. Whilst Galoain must overcome Erec by force or subterfuge, Oringles is in a position to impose his will as long as Erec is out of commission. Enite is shown to be entirely at the disposal of men and at the mercy of their anger, reinforcing the message of the 'power-powerlessness' relationship between man and woman (see 2.1.2 above). Although Enite is never consulted about her marriage to Erec, both Koralus and Erec emerge as benevolent by comparison with the two counts.

#### 2.1.5.3 Guivreiz

Erec's encounters with the short king, called Guivret by Chrétien and Guivreiz by Hartmann, have great structural significance in the narrative, in so far as they mark the end of the first and second cycles of adventures. However, they are somewhat less significant in relation to the theme of *zorn*. During the first encounter, Guivret becomes enraged when his sword breaks, and he throws the remaining fragment as far away as he can (*EE*. 3811-14), but this is his only display of anger and is probably to be ascribed to

<sup>78</sup> Compare *Parzival* 135,25ff. and 264,1-19. Nellmann (ed.) 1994 on *Pz.* 135,26 states: 'Die Ehefrau untersteht rechtlich der *munt* (Schutz-Herrschaft) ihres Mannes. Hieraus resultiert das Züchtigungsrecht des Mannes [...]. Besonders ungeschützt ist die Ehefrau beim Verdacht der Untreue. Hier darf der Ehemann zu extremen Strafen greifen.'

<sup>79</sup> Okken (1993: 166f. on 6671-73) points to similarities with the raising of Lazarus. However, Lazarus did not run around brandishing a sword.

frustration. In *Erec*, Guivreiz does not have occasion to lose his temper, for his sword does not break, and he does not show any signs of anger throughout the work.<sup>80</sup>

This in itself may be significant, for Guivreiz is another of the characters who offers both contrasts and comparisons with Erec.<sup>81</sup> His dwarf-like stature — ‘vil nâ getwerges genôz’ (4284) — suggests a contrast with Erec’s earlier encounter with Maliclisier.<sup>82</sup> The point here is not so much the difference between Maliclisier and Guivreiz as the difference in Erec’s disposition. His earlier keenness to discover Iders’s identity and then to avenge the slight to his honour contrasts sharply with his diffidence towards Guivreiz (4348-65). Once Erec has defeated Guivreiz, the contrast is with Erec’s treatment of Iders. Whereas Erec only went through the motions of being about to kill Iders, we are told that in Guivreiz’s case he ‘hâte nâch missetân, / wan er wolde in erslagen hân’ (4440f.).<sup>83</sup>

Furthermore, as a short but noble opponent with neither a wife nor an *amie*, Guivreiz contrasts not only with Erec himself but also with Erec’s giant-size yet noble opponent, Mabonagrîn.<sup>84</sup> When he first meets Erec, we are told ‘daz im an sîner manheit / unz an den tac nie misselanc’ (4309f.) and that ‘dehein ritterschaft er versaz’ (4314), perhaps contrasting with Erec’s earlier disposition ‘dô Êrec fil de roi Lac / ritterschefte sich bewac’ (2954f.). In so far as Guivreiz may represent a model of kingship for Erec to aspire to, the absence of anger would be in keeping with the medieval ideal of kingship.<sup>85</sup>

<sup>80</sup> It should be noted that, according to Wolfenbüttel fragment II,82f., Guivreiz’s sword does indeed break. However, the text is so fragmentary at this point that it is impossible to determine whether this is accompanied by any display of emotion.

<sup>81</sup> I focus here primarily on Erec’s first encounter with Guivreiz. The second encounter is quite different to any other encounter in *Erec*, for Guivreiz is accompanied by thirty knights (6854f.) and any attempt by Erec to engage with such superior numbers is doomed from the outset, a point quite deliberately made during the tournament that followed Erec’s wedding: ‘überkraft, / diu aller dinge ist meisterschaft, / — wider si niemen niht mac —’ (2678-80).

<sup>82</sup> For the recurrent appearance of dwarves in *Erec*, see Fritsch-Röbler 1998.

<sup>83</sup> Again, the poor preservation of the text at this point militates against close comparison with *Erec et Enide*. However, the fact that Guivret first spies Erec from his tower (*EE*. 3662f.) makes comparison with Yder’s dwarf difficult, and the French Erec actually intends to kill Yder, until the latter begs for mercy.

<sup>84</sup> See 2.1.5.5 below for the way in which Mabonagrîn represents the antithesis of true knightly endeavour.

<sup>85</sup> At no point in the text is there any overt criticism of Guivreiz. Jackson (1994: 126) describes Guivreiz as a ‘projection of Erec’s finer kingly and knightly self’ and as an ‘integrative figure’. However, as he earlier points out (1994: 123), scholarship has not always seen Guivreiz’s behaviour as exemplary. For the role of anger in kingship, see 1.7.

#### 2.1.5.4 Gawein and Keie

Gawein and Keie are stock characters in Arthurian romance, both with well-established roles in Arthurian society and distinctive character traits.<sup>86</sup> In *Erec*, they are presented as a pair from the outset.<sup>87</sup> The bond between them is sufficiently close that Keie is permitted to borrow Gawein's horse (4629<sup>24</sup>; 4785f.).<sup>88</sup>

The scene in which first Keie then Gawein meet Erec after the latter's first encounter with Guivreiz is of considerable importance for an understanding of Hartmann's view of *zorn*. Although the action in *Erec et Enide* follows a broadly similar line, there are minor differences which are of some significance. Despite the unsatisfactory state of the text at the point where Keie first meets Erec, it is clear that, as in the French text, Keie's initial approach is to grasp Erec's horse by the reins and demand to know his name (*EE*. 3963-69; *Erec* 4629<sup>40</sup>-4629<sup>43</sup>).<sup>89</sup> This is an ambiguous gesture, capable of interpretation as an act of friendly greeting or as the action of a victorious combatant (Peil 1975: 55f.).<sup>90</sup> Indeed, it seems that Erec interprets Keie's action as an affront, since the latter is obliged to defend his action, stating 'ir erbelget âne sache' (4629<sup>44</sup>).<sup>91</sup> The narrator makes Keie's dishonest intentions clear (4629<sup>56</sup>-4632) and proceeds to describe Keie's contradictory character traits (4633-64) in a way that instantly casts his actions in a dubious light.<sup>92</sup> However, Erec is not fooled and makes his excuses for not going to Artus's court (4665-77). When Keie insists, Erec is already 'ein teil dâ von bewegt' (4686), but it is Keie's suggestion 'ich twinge iuchs gütlichen' (4700) that is the last

<sup>86</sup> Thomasin refers to Kei and Gawein in one breath at the beginning of *Der Welsche Gast*: 'hân ich Gâweins hulde wol, / von reht mîn Key spotten sol' (*DWG* 77f.). He later uses them as *exempla* for young men, who are advised that they 'suln rihten sîn jugent / gar nâch Gâweins reiner tugent' (*DWG* 1043f.) but 'irn sult hern Key volgen niht' (*DWG* 1059). For more details about Keie, see Gowans 1988, Haupt 1971, Busby 1983, Classen 1988, Huby 1976 and Woledge 1969. The best overview of Gauvain/Gawein is Busby 1980.

<sup>87</sup> When Iders arrives at Artus's court, Gawein and Keie are the first to spot him. They are described as 'Walwân und der vriunt sîn, / der truhsæze Keiîn' (1152f.) and are said to have taken each other by the hand (1154), a gesture of friendship (Okken 1993: 44f.). For the co-existence in MS A of different name-forms for both Gawein and Keie, see Gärtner 1982: 416-24.

<sup>88</sup> This bond is not stressed in *Erec et Enide*. Although Gauvain and Keu are again the first to spot Yder, there is no suggestion of any special friendship between them. Later, Keu takes Gauvain's horse 'con par anvoiseüre' (3940), without any indication that he has permission to do so.

<sup>89</sup> Cormeau/Gärtner (1985: XV) say of the lead MS: 'A hat evidente Lücken: der Anfang fehlt; weiter fehlen 78 Verse nach 4629'. This apparent gap in the text is only partially filled by the Wolfenbüttel fragments.

<sup>90</sup> Peil points to Keie's dishonest intent.

<sup>91</sup> 'ir erbelget' is supplied by Leitzmann and Naumann to complete the line (Cormeau/Gärtner 1985: 157).

<sup>92</sup> The description of Keie's character is without precedent in the French text, where there is no attempt to rehabilitate Keu at all. Although Keu, unlike Keie, does eventually challenge Erec formally, he does so 'com hom plains de grant felenie' (4020).

straw: ‘daz tete Êrecke alrêst zorn’ (4704).<sup>93</sup> Keie’s very choice of phrase illuminates his contradictory nature, for the use of force, implied by *twingen*, is inconsistent with the friendly approach implied by *güetlîchen*.<sup>94</sup> Furthermore, Keie is clearly not in possession of the integrity which the application of *güete* would imply. It is this blatant dishonesty that arouses Erec’s *zorn*.

Erec’s initial intention is to sever Keie’s hand (4707-11), a gesture that at once recalls both the normal punishment for perjury and the punishment with which he had threatened Maliclisier.<sup>95</sup> Indeed, a contrast between this episode and Erec’s initial encounter with Maliclisier is evident, in so far as it is now Erec who is fully armed and Keie who is ‘gewæfens blôz’ (4722). Thus Erec is in a position to exact immediate revenge for any slight to his honour, whilst Keie is in no position to defend himself and is, by implication, ill-advised to provoke him.

Erec’s decision to strike Keie with the butt end of his lance is described by the narrator as a sign of his *tugent* (4723f.).<sup>96</sup> Keie is ‘der schalchafte man’ (4735), whilst Erec is ‘der guote’ (4744).<sup>97</sup> Nevertheless, Keie is allowed to escape with his life and at least some of his dignity intact, since Erec does not insist on confiscating Wintwalite. This reflects Erec’s magnanimity, but perhaps also explains why Hartmann gives Keie some redeeming features: an unremittingly bad character would not have merited such consideration.<sup>98</sup> However, Hartmann’s rehabilitation of Keie goes beyond this for, in contrast to the French text, not only is Keie able to make light of what has happened to

<sup>93</sup> There is no corresponding description of Erec’s emotional state in *Erec et Enide*.

<sup>94</sup> This is neatly captured by Resler (trans.) 1987: ‘I shall first force you to do so through friendly means’. Freytag 1972 has nothing to say on this line.

<sup>95</sup> Compare the severing of Wärbel’s hand at *Nibelungenlied* 1963,3 and the comments thereon by Müller (1998: 428). Note that this gesture is missing in the French text: Erec simply takes his sword in his hand (*EE*. 4029), an obviously threatening gesture but without any wider significance.

<sup>96</sup> Compare the Wolfenbüttel fragment, where Keie is simply ‘der untuginde genoz’ (*Erec W* 4723).

<sup>97</sup> This description links Keie to Oringles, who is also described as ‘der schalchafte man’ (6536). Keie’s normally irascible nature (see 2.2.2 and 3.2.1.4 below) is not developed in *Erec*. The link between them seems to lie not so much in their irascibility as in their opposition to Erec: Erec’s *tugent* (4629<sup>7</sup>, 4724, 4739, 4817) and *güete* (4744, 4818) contrast with Keie’s *valsche* (4629<sup>38</sup>, 4651, 4663, 4678). Oringles is similarly characterized as the opposite of Erec by his *untugent* (6517). Note, however, that in the Wolfenbüttel fragments, Erec’s ‘tugenthaften muot’ is replaced by ‘ritterlichin mût’ (*Erec W* 4739) and Keie addresses him as ‘edil’ instead of ‘tugenthafter man’ (*Erec W* 4817). Reference to Keie as ‘valsche’ is also absent at *Erec W* 4678.

him (4836-45), but he is also jointly charged with Gawein with the task of bringing Erec back to Artus's court (4861-65).

However, it is Gawein who takes the lead role and it is interesting to note that, just as Keie's character is considerably rehabilitated by comparison with his French equivalent, so the exemplary nature of Gawein's character is given added emphasis. On two occasions, Hartmann makes special mention of Gawein's role as the premier knight of the Round Table. As Enite is brought before the Round Table in all her finery, Hartmann expands Chrétien's reference to Gauvain as 'li premiers' amongst them (*EE*. 1672) to extol his great virtue (*Erec* 1617-29). Even more tellingly, the facts of Gauvain's achievements in the subsequent tournament (*EE*. 2168-78) are transformed into a veritable paean to Gawein's general excellence (*Erec* 2720-63). Erec is allowed to surpass Gawein 'just for the one day' (2757) and is the only knight to rival his reputation (2761-63).

Gawein demonstrates a very purposeful way of dealing with Erec's anger and, since we have been so forcibly reminded of his outstanding qualities, it seems reasonable to interpret his actions as exemplary. Like Erec himself, Gawein is 'tugentrîche' (4898) and he greets Erec 'nâch vriuntlîcher stimme / unde niht mit grimme' (4900f.), thus making it immediately clear that he is on friendly business and that this is not the sort of greeting that precedes single combat.<sup>99</sup> Gawein, 'der tugenthafte man' (5026), practises on Erec the same kind of 'schœner trûgeheit' (5034) that Erec and Enite have elsewhere practised on others. It is again the case that the end justifies the means, for Gawein's intentions are quite honourable. Although Erec is angry at the deceit practised on him and accuses Gawein of unbecoming behaviour (5045-67), both Gawein himself and the narrator are able to vindicate his approach:

Gâwein den zorn mit giûete rach.  
er hiels in zuo im unde sprach:  
,herre, senftet iuwer zorn.  
jâ ist ein vriunt baz verlorn

---

<sup>98</sup> See Okken 1993: 124 on Keie's 'gevieret' heart (4636) for the mixture of good and bad in his character. He apparently has the capacity to be 'vor valsche [...] / lûter sam ein spiegelglas' (4642f.) but is unable to maintain this disposition. Chrétien states that Erec is generous to Keu because the latter is not wearing armour (4022f.), but offers no further comment. It may be significant, however, that in *Erec et Enide* — unlike in *Erec* — Erec definitely recognizes Keu at the outset (3949), although we are not told that this influences his actions. Hartmann's text offers no clear evidence that Erec recognizes Keie before the latter has identified himself, although this cannot be ruled out, since Keie later claims to have recognized Erec by his voice alone (4854-57).

<sup>99</sup> The exact opposite happens later when Erec encounters Mabonagrîn: 'nû gehôrte er eine stimme / starc unde grimme' (8992f.). This is followed by Mabonagrîn's greeting: '[er] gruooste in ein teil vaste, / gelîch einem ûbelen man' (9025f.).



bescheidenlîchen unde wol  
 dan behalten anders dan er sol.  
 wirt im ein teil ze zorne gâch,  
 er verstât sich rehtes dar nâch  
 und hât in lieber dan ê. (5068-76)

This passage seems to reflect a body of traditional wisdom. The origin of the notion that it is better to lose a friend than keep him under false pretences is unclear.<sup>100</sup> However, this is followed by a reference to a well-known proverb, according to which anger between friends quickly evaporates.<sup>101</sup> Indeed, in this context, it is possible to see Gawein's embrace of Erec (5069), although it derives from *Erec et Enide* (4133-37), as the literal enactment of the proverb 'ira perit subito, quam gignit amicus amico'. However, the suggestion that friendship is strengthened after a quarrel seems to point to a variation on another popular theme in medieval literature, namely the idea that 'a little anger is good for love' (see 1.6.4 above). Once again, *güete* is seen to function as an antidote to *zorn* and, in this case, it is applied by and to the finest specimens of knighthood to outstanding effect. This is powerful evidence for its importance in Hartmann's constellation of chivalric virtues and, by inference, for the significance of *zorn* as a potential threat to social harmony.

By contrast, whilst Gauvain uses the same ruse, we are simply told 'Gauvains estoit de molt grant san' (4088). Although the French Erec is irritated at being delayed, he immediately accepts the situation as soon as he sees Arthur's tents (4110-24). There is no corresponding passage about the value of anger within friendship and no equivalent reference to the way that Gawein counters *zorn* with *güete*.

#### 2.1.5.5 Mabonagrín

The fight between Erec and Mabonagrín is characterized overwhelmingly by *grimme*. The sound of Mabonagrín's 'starc unde grimme' voice (8993) signals the beginning of Erec's final life-and-death encounter, the peril having already been intimated by Guivreiz and Ivrein, as well as by the presence of the eighty widows (without precedent in *Erec et Enide*) and the severed heads mounted on stakes outside the garden.

<sup>100</sup> Mieder (2001: 63f.) derives it from 'die besten Freunde müssen sich trennen', which seems to miss the mark. Closer parallels can be found in *Der deutsche Cato*: 'stant unrehtes niemen bî, / swie liep dir der vriunt sî' (115f.) and 'Manestu dînen vriunt ze vil / des er dir niht volgen wil, / ist er dir liep, swier denne tuot, / sô mane in doch, ob ez sî guot' (145-48). I am grateful to Prof. Tomas Tomasek for bringing these examples to my attention.

<sup>101</sup> See 1.6.4 above, also *TPMA* IV (1997), 'Freund', nos. 233-237 and 709-17 and *Wander I* (1867): 'Freund (Subst.)', no. 332 ('Gute Freund erzürnen sich auch wol miteinander, aber sie vertragen sich bald wieder'). Mieder 2001 ignores *Erec* 5073-76.

As in the French text, Mabonagrín is a Red Knight (*EE*. 5847-49; *Erec* 9015-19), but Hartmann tells us that he is ‘gewâfent nâch sînem muote’ (9020), which seems to reflect bloodthirstiness rather than irascibility (see 1.2.4.1 above):<sup>102</sup>

ich wæne sîn herze bluote  
swenne er niht ze vehtenne vant:  
sô mordic was sîn hant. (9021-23)

Both combatants are overcome by a particularly grim *furor heroicus*: ‘si erzeigten âne triegen / einen grimmeclîchen zorn’ (9081f.) and deal out ‘die grimmen slege’ (9139).<sup>103</sup> It is in this episode that the significance of *grimme* becomes particularly clear. Mabonagrín is angered by Erec’s powers of endurance: ‘mirst zorn daz dirre kleine man / alsô lange vor mir wert’ (9191f.) and is moved to grasp his sword ‘mit grimme’ (9193). His state of mind is described by the narrator: ‘[er] gedâhte eht vellen / sînen kamphgesellen’ (9194f.). It is a state of grim determination, of life-and-death earnest. He deals Erec a blow — ‘dirre grimmeclîche slac’ (9211) — which derives its force from his very heart (9199f.) and is sufficient to stun Erec momentarily, but at the cost of breaking the sword blade (9211-18). Now it is Erec’s turn: fired by thoughts of Enite (9230f.), he takes his sword in both hands ‘mit grimmen muote’ (9234) and ‘vaht im nâch dem bluote’ (9235). He fights with renewed vigour:

er ensluoc niht sam er ê phlac,  
sîn slege wâren grimmeclîch,  
zagen slegen ungelîch’ (9251-53)

When Mabonagrín realizes that Erec’s sword is broken, he sees his chance again and once more attacks ‘mit grimme’ (9275), but in the wrestling contest that follows, Erec is finally able to defeat Mabonagrín (9281-315).<sup>104</sup>

Hartmann’s Mabonagrín offers points of contrast and comparison not only with Erec but also with Guivreiz.<sup>105</sup> He is ‘vil nâch risen genôz’ (9013), just as Guivreiz is ‘vil nâ getwerges genôz’ (4284). Just as Erec’s first encounter with Guivreiz was presented as

<sup>102</sup> Chrétien’s Mabonagrín is simply ‘armé d’unes armes vermoilles’ (5849). Less emphasis is laid on the colour and little is said of his character.

<sup>103</sup> This is repeated within a few lines for emphasis: ‘hie ergie sô manec grimmer slac’ (9152).

<sup>104</sup> In *Erec et Enide*, the combat is presented as exhausting and bloody, but no special mention is made of Erec’s wrestling skills. The only suggestion of *furor heroicus* comes near the end, when both combatants drop their shields and ‘si s’antr’aerdent par grant ire’ (5945). Although Kleiber 1978 does not deal with this line, I take it as an example of *ire-colère*.

<sup>105</sup> Many critics have noted that Mabonagrín’s existence in the orchard with his wife represents a physical social isolation very similar to the spiritual social isolation of Erec and Enite in the early days of their married life at Karnant (See 1991: 50f.). Heartlessness is one of the qualities that set Mabonagrín apart from Erec, for we are told ‘der vil michel vâlant / in kunde niht erbarmen’ (9197f.). The term *vâlant* implies quite different qualities to those consistently embodied by Erec, namely *giete* and *tugent*, as well as *erbarme*.

his most serious challenge to date (4268-76), the combat with Mabonagrín is the most serious of all. Mabonagrín is as large and as pitiless as the giants that capture Cadoc, but in all other respects he is a knight. Guivreiz, on the other hand, is similar to Maliclisier only in stature. Furthermore, Guivreiz is a king who owns a fortified house, Penefrec, that is isolated by water, contains a walled hunting-ground, and wants for nothing (7124-94). Yet, despite the obvious attractions of Penefrec — ‘hie was diu kurzwîle guot’ (7187), we know that Guivreiz takes every opportunity to sally forth in search of knightly adventure (4314). Mabonagrín, on the other hand, is a nephew of the king of Brandigan (9407f.) and lives within an orchard that is isolated by a cloud of mist (8745-53), where knightly adventure comes to him. However, in Mabonagrín’s case, ‘daz ander paradîse’ (9542) has become a prison and it is Erec who releases him (9585f.).

Finally, the smaller man gets the better of the larger man, and Mabonagrín is beaten by Erec, just as Erec had been beaten by Guivreiz.<sup>106</sup> Mabonagrín is initially unwilling to surrender in case Erec is unworthy of victory (9345-50). This is the complete opposite of Guivreiz, who states:

sus ist ez mir unmære:  
 swer dîn vater wære,  
 sô edelet dich dîn tugent sô  
 daz ich dîn bin ze herren vrô. (4456-59)

In fact, Erec’s social status and family background are not entirely insignificant for Guivreiz, who subsequently states that he would nevertheless be comforted by the knowledge that he had been beaten by someone of noble breeding (4514-34). Mabonagrín’s opposite reaction to defeat draws attention to the problems inherent in a code of honour associated principally with birth, but without rejecting it entirely. Integrity, valour and personal worth are the necessary concomitants of nobility, without which its value is diminished.<sup>107</sup>

<sup>106</sup> Guivreiz is only able to defeat Erec because the latter has been physically weakened by his wounds (6926-36). Erec ostensibly defeats Mabonagrín because of his superior wrestling skills and because his armour is difficult to grasp firmly (9281-90). However, the suspicion lingers that Mabonagrín loses because his cause is morally weak.

<sup>107</sup> See Okken (1993: 121 on 4448-552): ‘Die *virtus* adelt den Adel’, also Borck 1978: 442: ‘Solche Anerkennung der *nobilitas carnis* und des auf ihr beruhenden Selbstverständnisses schließt für Hartmann freilich die Verpflichtung zu ethisch vorbildlicher Lebensführung ein.’ The French Mabonagrín, unlike his German counterpart, is ready to admit defeat (5960), but is similarly concerned about Erec’s status (5961-73). However, there is no suggestion that he would rather die than live with the shame of defeat by a lesser man.

## 2.2 *Iwein*

### 2.2.1 Introduction

Hartmann's *Iwein* follows its source, Chrétien's *Yvain*, much more closely than *Erec* follows *Erec et Enide* (Cormeau and Störmer 1993: 198-200). However, an examination of the role of *zorn* in *Iwein* yields surprising results. Whereas Erec can be seen to make controlled use of anger to assert his dominance within the marital sphere and to triumph over his unknightly adversaries, Iwein is frequently at the mercy of *zorn*, either from Laudine or in the form of 'ein zorn unde ein tobesuht' (3233) that afflicts him when Laudine breaks off their relationship. Furthermore, female *zorn*, almost entirely absent in *Erec*, is a prominent and problematic force in *Iwein*, exhibited by Laudine, Lunete and Ginover. Finally, in Iwein's lion, we have an example of human *zorn* given external agency.

In addition, there are a number of points in *Iwein* at which either the narrator or one of the characters makes generalized statements that have the character of proverbial or traditional wisdom (Weise 1910: 1-47). These statements are sometimes already embodied in Chrétien's text, but often Hartmann has added observations that simply seem to be inspired by the circumstances (Weise 1910: 18-28). Five of these statements illustrate various aspects of *zorn* that are encountered in the text.

The first example occurs when Lunete advises Laudine to take counsel from her vassals before marrying Iwein:

swer volget guotem râte,  
dem misselinget spâte.  
swaz der man eine tuot,  
und enwirtz dar nâch niht guot,  
sô hât er in zwei wîs verlorn:  
er duldet schaden und vriunde zorn. (2155-58)

The suggestion seems to be that *zorn* is one of the possible consequences of acting on one's own initiative, if things subsequently turn out badly. Lunete makes no such pronouncement at the equivalent point in *Yvain* (1845-50) and the inclusion of this well-known proverbial wisdom<sup>108</sup> would seem to characterize Hartmann's Lunete as a sensible counsellor to Laudine.<sup>109</sup> Yet there is irony here, since Lunete herself will suffer 'schaden und vriunde zorn' for advising Laudine to marry Iwein (see 2.2.7 below).

<sup>108</sup> See Weise 1910: 70, no. 120, also *TPMA IX* (1999): 'Rat', nos. 184-203.

<sup>109</sup> Weise (1910: 39f.) points out that *sententiae* expressed by the characters may offer a basis for characterization.

A quite different aspect of *zorn* is highlighted when Lunete explains to Iwein how she came to be accused of treason:

wan daz ist gar der sælden slac,  
swer sînem zorne niene mac  
getwingen, ern überspreche sich. (4141-43)

Here, uncontrolled *zorn* is seen to be the cause, rather than the consequence, of disaster. As with the first example, this represents well-known proverbial wisdom which is without precedent at the equivalent point in *Yvain*.<sup>110</sup> However, at first sight, the knowledge of such wisdom appears to characterize Lunete as foolhardy, since she clearly should have known better (see 2.2.7 below).

A very similar sentiment is echoed in the words of Laudine, after she has initially rejected Lunete's advice to marry Iwein:

ich möhte wol verwâzen  
mîne zornige site:  
wan dâ gewinnet niemen mite  
niuwan schande unde schaden. (2026-29)<sup>111</sup>

The French Laudine does not make any such statement, although she does beg Lunete's forgiveness for speaking presumptuously (1795-97) and has evidently been angry with her (1720-26) (Kleiber 1978: 262).

In a fourth instance, Hartmann shows that *zorn* may nonetheless be controlled. When the Lady of Narison discovers that all the precious ointment given to her by Feimorgan has been used up and she hears her lady-in-waiting's felicitous lie, there is potential for her to lose her temper, as the narrator comments: 'doch zurnte sî ein teil' (3681).<sup>112</sup> However, she talks herself out of becoming truly angry:

'niemen habe seneden muot  
umbe ein verlornen guot  
des man niht wider müge hân.'  
hie mit was der zorn ergân. (3691-94)

<sup>110</sup> See Weise 1910: 60, no. 67. Okken (1993: 345f. on 4134-55) also draws attention to similar sentiments in Horace's *Epistles* and in Ecclesiasticus. Lines 4125-44 are missing in MS z (Wolff II: 125).

<sup>111</sup> This has the character of proverbial wisdom, but appears to have been overlooked by Weise 1910 and Eikermann 1998. McConeghy draws attention to the similarity with *Iwein* 4139f. See *TPMA* XIII (2002): 'Zorn', nos. 163-65 ('Zorn ist Ursache von Übel und Schaden').

<sup>112</sup> The full consequences of this may be deduced from the fact that the lady-in-waiting has been commanded 'on pain of death' (3439, McConeghy (trans.) 1984) not to anoint Iwein all over. The equivalent admonition in *Yvain* is less severe (2964-73).

This well-known sentiment is already found in *Yvain*, where the Lady of Noroison exclaims ‘Mes des que la chose est alee, / Il n’i a que del consirrer’ (3118f.).<sup>113</sup> In both texts, the Lady is thus characterized by her wisdom, which in *Iwein* is synonymous with the abandonment of anger. However, the loss of the ointment presages the loss of the hero himself, who resists all attempts to persuade him to stay (*Yvain* 3314-40; *Iwein* 3802-27). In the French text, Yvain leaves the Lady in some distress (3324-29),<sup>114</sup> whilst in *Iwein* there is no mention of the lady’s mental state.

The fifth and final example occurs when Gawein thanks Lunete for her intervention on Iwein’s behalf:

wan zewâre ez ist guot,  
 swer gerne vrûmeclîchen tuot,  
 daz mans im genâde sage,  
 daz er dar an iht verzage  
 (wan dâ hœrt doch arbeit zuo);  
 und swer ouch dankes missetuo,  
 daz man dem erbolgen sî:  
 der ziuhet sich ouch lîhte derbî. (2731-38)

This is without precedent at the equivalent point in *Yvain* (2418-51) and seems to me to be a very important passage for the interpretation of *Iwein*, although its content has not hitherto been satisfactorily explained.<sup>115</sup> It divides into two distinct parts. The sentiment expressed in the first five lines (2731-35) is repeated at a critical moment, immediately before the onset of Iwein’s crisis, again without precedent in *Yvain*, when Artus thanks Iwein and Gawein for their many victories on the field:

swer gerne vrûmeclîchen tuot,  
 der dem gnâdet, daz ist guot:  
 in gezimt der arbeit deste baz. (3077-79)<sup>116</sup>

This is, in fact, well-known proverbial wisdom about the importance of gratitude.<sup>117</sup> By going out of his way to thank Lunete, Gawein provides a perfect example of

<sup>113</sup> See Weise 1910: 56, no. 39, also *TPMA* XII (2001): ‘verlieren’, nos. 107-32. Okken (1993: 332 on 3682-93) points to a similar sentiment in the *Disticha Catonis*. Note that, in *Yvain*, the Lady of Noroison is grieved rather than angered by the loss, her ‘mout grant ire’ (3114) representing *ire-douleur* (Kleiber 1978: 120).

<sup>114</sup> ‘Et leissa mout la dame irree’ (3325) is another example of *ire-douleur* (Kleiber 1978: 131).

<sup>115</sup> Weise (1910: 99, no. 247) lists no parallels and Okken 1993 is silent on these lines. McConeghy (trans.) 1984 on *Iwein* 2736-38 contends that ‘Hartmann’s advice seems to conflict with Gawein’s standards for knightly behavior when dealing with other knights, where criticism is to be silenced (2509-21)’, but this seems to me to miss the point. It should also be noted that ll. 2731-38 are missing in MS *z* (Wolff II: 91).

gratefulness. Another good example occurs later, when the lion shows its gratitude to Iwein after the latter has intervened on its behalf ‘als ein vrum man’ (3861).<sup>118</sup> Both provide a stark contrast to the behaviour of Iwein, whose failure to keep his promise to Laudine also suggests a lack of gratitude to Lunete, as she points out (3140-46).<sup>119</sup>

The second part of the passage cited (2736-38) is rather different in tone and suggests that anger might be legitimately used to correct another’s deliberate misdeeds. This is perhaps a case of *ira per zelum*, where anger directed towards one’s own sins or the sins of others can be justified (see 1.7 above). It is also similar to sentiments expressed in *Der deutsche Cato* and in *Der Welsche Gast*.<sup>120</sup> This opens up the possibility of a positive interpretation of Laudine’s *zorn* towards Iwein, since it certainly prompts him to mend his ways. However, Hartmann’s insertion of the word ‘dankes’ (2736) must still cast a shadow over Laudine’s actions, since there is never any suggestion of deliberate misbehaviour by Iwein, as will be seen.

### 2.2.2 Ginover

Although she is twice named as Ginover in *Erec* (5100 and 7230) and once named as Guenievre in Chrétien’s *Yvain* (6176), Artus’s queen is never named in *Iwein*. In this, she resembles Latinus’s unnamed queen in Heinrich von Veldeke’s *Eneasroman*.

---

<sup>116</sup> Weise (1910: 99, no. 249) again lists no parallels. Eikermann (1998: 77) links these two *sententiae*, using them to illustrate the point that *sententiae*, as opposed to proverbs, are usually closely bound to the values and the narrative world of the text that they originate from. He comments: ‘Diese enge Textbindung wird besonders in den Fällen deutlich, in denen Sentenzen das ethische Programm eines Romans zusammenfassen.’ Later, Eikermann (82, fn. 34) lists both *sententiae* as part of a sequence of sayings centred on *vrūmekheit* and *êre*.

<sup>117</sup> See *TPMA* V (1997): ‘gut’, nos. 494-513 (‘Wohltat verdient Dankbarkeit’).

<sup>118</sup> The origins and treatment of the theme of the grateful lion up to the twelfth century have been extensively studied, see especially Brodeur 1924. Less well studied, but of equal interest for a full understanding of *Iwein*, is the development of the theme in the later Middle Ages. Quite neglected, as far as the *Yvain/Iwein* story is concerned, is the theme of the ungrateful serpent, see Goldberg 1996. The latter seems to have been well-known in the Middle Ages, to judge from the number of Latin and German variants, see Dicke and Grubmüller 1987: nos. 431 and 512. Goldberg (1996: 254) alludes to the interchangeability of serpent, snake, crocodile and *Drache*. Dicke and Grubmüller specifically list the dragon as a frequent variant of serpent for no. 512. Seen against this background, the conflict of lion and dragon offers the hero the opportunity to choose between gratitude or ingratitude. This is an issue which, I would contend, is more highly developed in *Iwein* than in *Yvain*, but which cannot be pursued here.

<sup>119</sup> Lunete was, of course, originally motivated to help *Yvain/Iwein* out of gratitude for his courtesy towards her at Artus’s court (*Yvain* 1001-15; *Iwein* 1178-97). By having Lunete (*Iwein* 3103), rather than an anonymous maiden, upbraid Iwein in front of Artus for his failure to keep his promise, Hartmann is able to focus attention on Iwein’s lack of gratitude and failure to reciprocate.

<sup>120</sup> ‘Du solt bî manegem bilde nemen / welch dinc dir sülle missezemen; / dem vrūmen soltu volgen, / dem bösen wis erbolgen’ (*Cato* 379-82), see 1.6.1 above; ‘zürne wider die bōsheit’ (*DWG* 10101), see 1.6.2.

Indeed, these two characters share not only their royal rank, but also an angry disposition, although Artus's queen, hereinafter referred to as Ginover, is by no means as extreme as Latinus's queen in this respect.<sup>121</sup>

Ginover's *zorn* comes to the fore in her blistering attack on Kei (137-58), which is more than three times the length of the equivalent speech in *Yvain* (86-91). We are instantly told that 'Kei den zorn niht vertruoc' (159) and Kei goes on to reproach the queen for her immoderate anger:

vrouwe, habet gnâde mîn,  
und lât sus grôzen zorn sîn.  
iuwer zorn ist ze ungenâdeclich:  
nien brechet iuwer zuht durch mich. (177-80)<sup>122</sup>

There is a certain irony to the fact that 'der zuhtlôse Kei' (90) advises the queen on a matter of *zuht* (180) whilst submitting to her *zuht* and *meisterschaft* (165), having mocked Kalogrenant's display of *zuht* (124), which any one of those present would have emulated, given half the chance (128-31).<sup>123</sup> Hartmann puns here on the meaning of *zuht*, which originally meant *inter alia* 'reprimand' or 'punishment' but came to refer to 'good manners' or 'courtly behaviour' (Jaeger 1985: 129-33).<sup>124</sup> Kei is both boorish and unbridled, whilst Kalogrenant's behaviour is both courteous and a reprimand to his colleagues. Ginover, meanwhile, is both corrective and offensive towards Kei.

As seneschal, Kei has an important role at Artus's court (see 3.2.1.4 below). His merciless criticism of Kalogrenant is not without foundation, since the latter's tale does not redound to his own honour or, by extension, to the honour of Artus's court. Furthermore, Kei's insistence that Kalogrenant continue with his tale (223-29) forces the latter to parade his disgrace before the queen. Thanks to Kei, a matter of private titillation amongst comrades becomes a matter of *êre*, prompting Iwein's desire to seek revenge for his cousin (803-09). It is therefore perhaps unsurprising that Kei is unpopular at court.<sup>125</sup>

Since Kei's authority over the queen is limited, he restricts himself to reminding her:

ir sprechet alze sêre

<sup>121</sup> For the anger of Latinus's queen (Amata), see Magner 1996.

<sup>122</sup> Lines 179f. are missing from MS D (Wolff II: 20).

<sup>123</sup> The irony is underlined by Thomasin's view that *zorn* and *zuht* are incompatible, see 1.6.2.

<sup>124</sup> Hartmann's pun elaborates on Kei's ironic references to Kalogrenant's *corteisie* in *Yvain* (71-85).

<sup>125</sup> This is clear in both the French and German texts, although Hartmann does come to his defence (2565-74). However, it is interesting to note Bumke's suggestion (1992: 438, fn. 86): 'Der Grund für die negative Beleuchtung der Hofbeamten ist wohl darin zu sehen, daß die Inhaber der Hofämter als Ministerialen gedacht sind. Offenbar suchten die höfischen Dichter ihren fürstlichen Auftraggebern dadurch zu gefallen, daß sie die Ministerialen in ein schlechtes Licht setzten.'



den rittern an ir êre.  
 wir wârens an iu ungewon:  
 ir werdet unwert dervon (167-70)

This is a clear criticism of the queen's behaviour, much more blatant than the equivalent passage in *Yvain*, where the queen is simply warned to behave herself (92-94). It is also noticeable that, in *Yvain*, the formal mode of address is maintained throughout by all parties to the conversation. In *Iwein*, by contrast, Ginover addresses Kei alone in the informal mode (137-58).<sup>126</sup> However, she apparently takes heed of Kei's criticism, addressing him subsequently in the formal mode (837-54).

This is a very significant passage for the interpretation of the work as a whole, since it problematizes queenly anger at the outset. In *Iwein*, Laudine too is a queen (2340; 2358; 2663; 2880; 2887; 8121),<sup>127</sup> and there are distinct points of comparison and contrast between Ginover's *zorn* and Laudine's *zorn*. The impression is created that Keie is deliberately offensive. This seems to be confirmed by the narrator's reference to his 'alte gewonheit' (108-12; 810-14) and by the remarks made by the queen (137-58; 838-54) and Kalogrenant (190-221). Indeed, Iwein himself later refers sarcastically to Kei's habit of upbraiding people 'mit selher vuoge als er ie pflac, / die niemen wol gezürnen mac' (863f.). Both Kalogrenant and the queen make Keie's heart responsible for his tongue (196f.; 838-41), pointing to an offensive nature. Keie would therefore appear to be the sort of person with whom one might legitimately be angry in the hope of correcting his ways. This would seem to be implicit in Gawein's suggestion that 'swer ouch dankes missetuo, / daz man dem erbolgen sî' (2736f.) and in related proverbial wisdom (see 2.2.1 above). Nevertheless, the queen's anger is misplaced: not only is Keie not wholly bad (2565-74), he is also a member of the royal household and therefore deserving of more consideration — hence his complaint 'ir strâfet mich als einen kneht' (171). The queen's anger flies in the face of proverbial wisdom that one should restrain anger towards members of one's household (see 1.6.1 above and 2.2.8.3 below). Ginover's treatment of Keie is thus comparable to Laudine's treatment of Iwein and Lunete (see 2.2.8.2 and 2.2.8.3 below).

<sup>126</sup> Similarly, in the *Eneasroman*, Amata addresses Latinus in the informal mode, whilst he addresses her formally (*En.* 120,36-125,19). Here, too, the queen's behaviour is associated with a loss of *zuht*: 'ir zuhte sie vergaz' (*En.* 121,1).

<sup>127</sup> References to Laudine as queen are particularly prone to MSS variation. Line 8121, in particular, belongs to that part of the text preserved only in MSS Bad (Wolff II: 219f.). In *Yvain*, Laudine is 'Laudine de Landuc, / [...] fille au duc / Laudunet' (2151-53). These lines are also particularly prone to variation in the MSS, but her status as daughter of a duke seems clear, see Woledge I (1986): 135-38 on *Yvain* 2152-7 (WF 2150-55).

In addition, the very nature of the opening scene begs comparison with the opening scene in *Erec*, where Erec's ability to control his *zorn* (*Erec* 99-103) contrasts with the queen's apparent inability to do so in *Iwein*.<sup>128</sup> Most obviously, Ginover is present in both opening scenes, when the hero is initially propelled into action, but it is also noticeable that *zuht* plays an important part in the opening scene of *Erec* as well (*Erec* 31; 36; 79). Just as the fact that Erec's *unêre* has been witnessed by the queen and her lady-in-waiting (*Erec* 104-09) prompts him to set out in pursuit of Iders, similarly, the revelation before the queen of Kalogrenant's *laster* (790; 796) prompts Iwein to seek revenge (803-09).

### 2.2.3 Artus

Artus is associated with *zorn* on three occasions. The first of these occurs when he awakes and joins the group who have been sitting, listening to Kalogrenant's tale:

sî sprungen ûf: daz was im leit  
und zurnde durch gesellekheit:  
wander was in weizgot verre  
baz geselle dan herre. (885-88)

This remark is without precedent in *Yvain* and points to a moderation of Artus's authority over his knights that is less obvious in the French text.<sup>129</sup> However, it also points to a contrast between Artus and Ginover. Standing up is a mark of respect (Peil 1975: 54f.) and, whereas only Kalogrenant manages to rise when the queen arrives, everyone rises for the king's arrival. Artus's annoyance may be prompted by a 'sense of fellowship' (McConeghy (trans.) 1984: 39), but it suggests a confident and easy relationship between lord and knights that evidently does not exist between queen and knights. Ginover's anger appears defensive by comparison and suggests that, in the absence of Artus, her position is much less secure.

There is also a contrast between Artus and the wild man, who exercises authority over the wild beasts that surround him. Whereas Artus enjoys a certain amount of camaraderie with his knights, the wild man rules the beasts entirely by fear (494f.; 506-10) (see 2.2.4 below). Artus's friendly annoyance (886) contrasts with the wild man's genuinely fear-inspiring *zorn* (514). Nevertheless, the wild man instantly leaps to his feet at Kalogrenant's approach (471-74), signalling his inferior social status as a 'gebûre' (432). The contrast is thus not between Artus and the wild man as individuals,

<sup>128</sup> Kern 1998 has drawn attention to the importance of *Erec* as a forerunner of *Iwein*.

<sup>129</sup> In *Yvain*, the knights spring to their feet and Artus simply has them sit down again (653-55).

for there is no comparison between a king and such an ugly figure: the contrast lies in the nature of their authority, which finds its expression in *zorn*.

The second instance of Artus's anger is again without precedent in *Yvain* and occurs during Ginover's abduction (4290-302; 4526-726), which Hartmann recounts in far more detail than his source, as has been noted often (Christoph 1989: 17; Grubmüller 1991: 8; Kugler 1996: 115; Wynn 1998: 134). When he is denied a boon, the unnamed knight, later revealed to be Meljaganz, storms out of court 'vil harte zornlichen' (4557), signalling a break in social relations between himself and Artus. References to 'diz bâgen' (4566) and to his departure 'mit selhen unminnen' (4576) emphasize the rift. However, when Artus changes his mind, Meljaganz soon reveals himself to be 'ein vrâvel man' (4585) and demands the queen. As the narrator comments, 'daz hæte die sinne / dem künege vil nâch benomen' (4588f.). The subsequent reference to his 'zürnen' (4593) confirms Artus's anger at this turn of events.

Artus's change of heart is motivated by the advice he receives from his knights (4566-82). He feels that he has been deceived and that 'die disen rât tâten, / die hânt mich verrâten' (4591f.). Artus's *zorn* therefore arises precisely because he has followed advice, as advocated by Lunete in her discussions with Laudine (2155-58) (see 2.2.1 above and 2.2.8.3 below). The sentiment 'swer volget guotem râte, / dem misselinget spâte' (2153f.) seems entirely reasonable and perfectly applicable to Artus's situation: the difficulty lies in distinguishing good advice from bad. Where proverbial wisdom suggests that to follow one's own instincts without consultation is to court 'schaden und vriunde zorn' (2155-58), Artus experiences the exact opposite: if he had ignored his knights' advice, he would not have suffered *schaden* and *zorn* at all.

The third example of Artus's anger occurs within the context of the legal dispute between the two daughters of the Count 'von dem Swarzen dorne' (5629). The king's anger is aroused by the intransigence of the elder daughter. The younger daughter has already offered to withdraw her claim in order to spare the lives of the combatants (7304-20), prompting those present to beseech Artus to intervene and exact a compromise solution from the elder sister (7323-32). He, however, is loath to agree to this:

done wold ers niht volgen:  
er was sô sêre erbolgen  
der altern durch ir herten muot:  
in dûht diu junger alsô guot  
daz er sî nôte verstiez,

wand sî sich gar verliez  
ze sînem hoverehte. (7335-41)

Hartmann avoids any overt pronouncement on the rights and wrongs of the case.<sup>130</sup> However, the importance of submission to the will of the court, i.e. the king, is reiterated when Artus pronounces judgement:

ouch hât sich diu guote  
mit einvaltem muote  
sô gar her ze mir verlân:  
diu muoz ir teil ze rehte hân. (7691-94)

In order to secure the submission of the elder daughter, he has to threaten her with an adverse judgement if she will not voluntarily share the inheritance with her sister (7695-702).<sup>131</sup>

Diz redte er, wander weste  
ir herze alsô veste  
an hertem gemüete,  
durch reht noch durch güete  
enhete sîz nimmer getân. (7703-07)

The elder daughter's conduct thus shows a deficiency in *güete* as well as in *reht* — consequently, she is referred to as 'diu unguote' (5663) — whereas her sister is possessed of all the virtues (7297-301) and is specifically 'diu guote' (7299; 7338; 7691). Since *güete* is such an important quality for defusing *zorn*, as has already been seen in *Erec*, it is hardly surprising that the elder daughter incurs the king's wrath. There are, however, two other points which arise from this episode.

Firstly, Artus is seen here to exert an entirely different kind of authority to that seen in the opening scene. Like the wild man and his beasts, he has to rely on brute force to coerce the elder daughter: 'sî muose gewalt od vorhte hân: / nû gewan sî vorhte von der drô' (7708f.). His anger therefore represents that authority. Secondly, in this scene, Artus is seen to brush aside the advice of his courtiers without a second thought (7335), leading to a happy ending for all concerned (7718-21). The implication would seem to be that justice is not open to debate.

<sup>130</sup> For the legal background to the dispute, see Mertens 1978: 100-04. According to Mertens, the two sisters represent opposing but equally valid points of view — see also McConeghy (trans.) 1984 on *Iwein* 5638. By contrast, Chrétien makes frequent reference to the elder daughter's *tort* (5884, 5910, 6346, 6409).

<sup>131</sup> Note that these lines are only in this position in MSS ABDEH. They are missing in cf and misplaced after 7716 in Jabdlpr (Wolff II: 208). Wolff surmises that these lines may represent a late addition by Hartmann. See also McConeghy (trans.) 1984 on *Iwein* 7695-702.

#### 2.2.4 The Wild Man

The grotesque wild man encountered by both Kalogrenant and Iwein is of particular interest with regard to *zorn*. Although he describes himself quite specifically as a human being (*Yvain* 330; *Iwein* 488), both Chrétien and Hartmann give a lengthy description of the *Waldmensch*, ironically abounding in animal attributes (*Yvain* 288-313; *Iwein* 425-70). He is thus portrayed as an outsider, the antithesis of a courtly knight (Milnes 1961: 241-43).

Some of the wild man's attributes are suggestive of anger: in particular, his large size (*Yvain* 289; *Iwein* 428) and huge club (*Yvain* 293; *Iwein* 469) mark him out as being similar to a giant, traditionally associated with anger.<sup>132</sup> His eyes are specifically 'rôt, zornvar' (451) (see 1.2.4.1 above) and he has unkempt hair (433-35), recalling the traditional portrayal of *Ira* in Prudentius's *Psychomachia* (see 1.3.3 above).<sup>133</sup>

In both *Yvain* and *Iwein*, the wild man exercises authority over wild beasts. Hartmann's wild man is to be found sitting amongst a group of different animals which are fighting 'mit grimme / mit griulîcher stimme' (403-20), whilst the equivalent figure in *Yvain* is simply described as sitting on a stump (292) as wild bulls fight amongst themselves (278-87).<sup>134</sup> In both texts, the beasts live in fear of the wild man: in *Yvain*, the wild man describes how he controls them by brute force and is the only one able to do so (344-54), whereas in *Iwein*, he states that the beasts respond to 'mîn zunge und mîn hant, / mîn bete und mîn drô' (506f.): he is their *meister* and *herre* (495) implying a broader authority, not unlike the authority wielded by a lord over his vassals, but here in a more primitive setting.<sup>135</sup> The *zorn* of the wild man seems to symbolize this authority, for Kalogrenant responds 'herre, vürhtents dînen zorn, / sô gebiut in vride her ze mir' (514f.).<sup>136</sup>

As Milnes (1961) has seen, there are similarities between the wild man, who is compared to 'einem walttôren' (440), and the mad Iwein, who runs off into the forest as 'ein tôre in dem walde' (3260) after his public disgrace (see 2.2.9.1 below). On the one

<sup>132</sup> See 1.7 above. Habiger-Tuczay (1999: 654) describes the giant's typical weapons and states that they are also wielded by 'die wilden Leute'. She also (647-650) draws attention to the association of giants with forests and wild places.

<sup>133</sup> Chrétien's wild man also has a tufted hairstyle (297), as well as a twisted moustache (305) and 'iauz de cuête' (302). By the time of the Renaissance, the screech-owl was often associated with demons (Cameron 1976). Such an association would not be out of place here.

<sup>134</sup> There is considerable variation in the MSS at *Yvain* 280 (Reid 1942: 190; Woledge I (1986): 74-76). Bulls, bears, leopards and lions are all attested.

<sup>135</sup> Compare the authority of Artus (see 2.2.3 above).

hand, the relationship between the wild man and the beasts represents a primitive form of hierarchy which has its more complex counterpart in the relationship between lord and vassals in the courtly world. On the other hand, the superiority of man over beast, evident also in Iwein's primitive existence in the forest, represents the triumph of order over chaos and the subjugation of the emotions to reason and the will.<sup>137</sup> However, the wild man is conscious of exercising authority and control in a way that Iwein is not.

### 2.2.5 Askalon

Askalon, the defender of the magic fountain, is twice associated with *zorn*. When Kalogrenant describes his encounter with Askalon, he prepares the listener/reader for his defeat. After describing Askalon's approach as akin to that of an army (693-97), he goes on to state:

sîn ors was starc, er selbe grôz;  
des ich vil lützel genôz.  
sîn stimme lûte sam ein horn:  
ich sach wol, im was an mich zorn. (699-702)

Askalon reacts in his capacity as lord and king to defend his territory.<sup>138</sup> His *zorn* marks him as the defender of the fountain and the aggrieved party, the victim of unprovoked aggression from Kalogrenant, which has cost him damage to his forest and the wildlife therein (712-30). However, Askalon's own words cast a shadow over his actions:

daz kint daz dâ ist geslagen,  
daz muoz wol weinen unde clagen:  
alsus clag ich von schulden. (723-25)

The notion of justifiable complaint is already present in Chrétien's version, where Esclados asserts 'plaindre se doit, qui est batuz' (502).<sup>139</sup> However, Askalon's reference to the behaviour of children is without precedent in *Yvain* and is one of several references in Hartmann's works to children's limited powers of reasoning.<sup>140</sup> Askalon's

<sup>136</sup> Kalogrenant's response is without precedent in *Yvain*.

<sup>137</sup> Okken (1993: 270 on 440) comments: 'Der Wilde macht keinen Gebrauch von der menschlichen Vernunft; also ist der Wilde ein Irrer, ein Narr, ein *tôre*.' However, the wild man is able to converse rationally with Kalogrenant and Iwein (unlike the mad Iwein, who does not speak until his recovery) and to exercise authority – he just looks like a *tôre*.

<sup>138</sup> It is clear from the discussion between Laudine and Lunete after Askalon's death that failure to defend the fountain would lead to the loss of fountain, land and *êre* (1820-62).

<sup>139</sup> See Weise 1910: 22. Woledge I (1986): 83 comments 'Ce vers a l'air d'un proverbe, mais il manque dans Morawski (= *Proverbes français antérieurs au Xve siècle*, Paris, 1925).'

<sup>140</sup> Weise (1910: 53, no. 22) draws attention to *Erec* 3876f., *A. Heinr.* 949-54, *Iwein* 2894-98, *Iwein* 3320-22, and *A. Heinr.* 333f. See also Lunete's assertion: 'ich bin ein wîp: nâem ich mich an / ze râtenne als ein wîser man, / sô wær ich tumber danne ein kint' (7851-53).

remark would therefore seem to suggest that his *zorn* is really rather immature and ill-considered.<sup>141</sup>

This is in marked contrast to the situation in *Yvain*, where Esclados's anger is described with more flourish:

Et cil come mautalantis  
Vint plus tost qu'uns alerions,  
Fiers par sanblant come lions. (486-88)<sup>142</sup>

On the second occasion, when Askalon finally meets Iwein, we are simply told 'sî hete beide überladen / grôz ernest unde zorn' (1010f.). This time, Hartmann does not report any conversation between the two men, we are simply told that Askalon greets Iwein 'als vîent sînen vîent sol' (1003). It would therefore seem that *zorn* here simply represents *furor heroicus* (see 1.7.3 above), afflicting each man in equal measure. This no doubt reflects the fact that Iwein is a far better match than his cousin for Askalon. Once again, the anger of Esclados is described with more colour in *Yvain*:

Vint, d'ire plus ardanç que brese,  
Li chevaliers a si grant bruit,  
Con s'il chaçast un cerf de ruit. (812-14)<sup>143</sup>

The impression of equal ardour on both sides is conveyed by the vocabulary used. Thus we are told that they 's'antrevirent', 's'antrevindrent', 's'antrehaïssent de mort' and 's'antredonent si granz cos' (*Yvain* 815-19).<sup>144</sup> The fact that both their hauberks become so hot as to be useless is also suggestive of equal combat fervour (845-47).<sup>145</sup>

## 2.2.6 Laudine's *gesinde*

In *Yvain*, the local populace's frenzied attempts to locate the killer of Esclados are strongly characterized by anger. However, the crowd is also described in quite derogatory terms. According to Lunete, they are a rabble comprising 'jant mout enuieuse et male' (1068) who will be 'si avuglé, / Si desconfit, si desjuglé, / Que il

<sup>141</sup> This is not the only aspect of Askalon's actions that seems questionable. Okken (1993: 279 on 731-56), following Jackson, points out that Askalon's failure to make peace with Kalogrenant leaves the way open for a friend or relative to take up the quarrel on the latter's behalf. This is, of course, exactly what happens.

<sup>142</sup> See 1.2.5.2 above for the association of lions with anger. Eagles could also be associated with anger, (Harris 1994: 281f., fn. 38). Although these lines are not specifically discussed by Kleiber, the use of the adjective *mautalentif* would seem to point to *ire-colère* (Kleiber 1978: 369f.).

<sup>143</sup> See Kleiber 1978: 266. For anger as heat, see also 1.2.1 above.

<sup>144</sup> With regard to *Yvain* 815-7, Woledge I (1986): 92 cites Frappier: 'La violence avec laquelle s'attaquent deux adversaires — Esclados et Yvain — est suggérée par le heurt de deux verbes, l'un à la rime, l'autre au début du vers suivant'.

<sup>145</sup> The interpretation of these lines is not entirely unproblematic (Woledge I (1986): 93). For the association of heat with anger, see 1.2.1 above.

esrageront tuit d'ire' (1077-79).<sup>146</sup> Sure enough, Yvain sees 'jant felenesse et angresse' (1092) and then 'il les veoit esragier / Et forsener et correcier' (1109f.).<sup>147</sup> They are 'trestuit d'ire eschaufé' (1132) as they beat about the room, looking for Yvain.<sup>148</sup> Once the dead man's wounds reopen, their efforts reach fever pitch and they become bathed in sweat (1188) and deranged (1195). Finally, Lunete describes them as searching more carefully than a pack of hounds stampeding through the room in pursuit of partridges or quail:

Mout ont par ceanz tanpesté  
Et reverchié toz cez quachez  
Plus menuëmant, que brachez  
Ne va traçant perdriz ne quaille. (1264-67)

It is an image of unruly mob behaviour, driven by animal instinct rather than intelligence, and there is no little irony in the suggestion that such a search is conducted 'menuëmant'. Its thoroughness derives solely from its violence. Lunete's description therefore adds the final touch to a picture of the populace as base, stupid and prone to being carried away by emotion.<sup>149</sup>

In *Iwein*, the populace is equally angry, but Hartmann refrains from overtly derogatory comments. After Iwein has penetrated Askalon's castle, he immediately encounters Lunete, who informs him of the peril he is in:

man mac sô jæmerlîchez clagen  
an mîner lieben vrouwen  
und an dem gesinde schouwen,  
und sô grimmeclîchen zorn,  
daz ir den lîp hânt verlorn. (1160-64)

As will be seen, Laudine's *zorn* proves to be far more dangerous for Iwein in the long term than that of the *gesinde*. The latter are easily frustrated by means of the magic ring that Lunete provides, whose stone renders the bearer invisible. When the populace see Iwein's dead horse, they break down both gates (1267).<sup>150</sup> When they find no-one 'do begunden sî von zorne toben / und got noch den tiuvel loben' (1271f.). The effect is that they are 'mit gesehenden ougen blint' (1277)<sup>151</sup> and strike out wildly with their swords

<sup>146</sup> These lines do not seem to be dealt with by Kleiber 1978. However, subsequent clear references to *ire-colère* confirm that anger is in play here.

<sup>147</sup> *ire-colère* (Kleiber 1978: 384).

<sup>148</sup> *ire-colère* (Kleiber 1978: 287 and 303).

<sup>149</sup> For just or righteous anger as the prerogative of the nobility, see 1.7 above.

<sup>150</sup> This sort of behaviour is elsewhere associated with *zorn*, e.g. in *Erec*, when Galoain kicks down the door at the inn (*Erec* 4044-48). See 1.2.2 and 2.1.5 above.

<sup>151</sup> Compare *Iwein* 7058, where *unkünde* makes Iwein and Gawein 'mit sehenden ougen blint'. This image has its origins in the Bible (Okken 1993: 285 on 1274-78).



(1291-97). Similarly, after the dead man's wounds have begun to bleed anew, the populace once again strike out everywhere in an effort to find Iwein:

wand sî sîns tôdes gerten  
alsam der wolf der schâfe tuot.  
von zorne tobet in der muot. (1378-80)

The use of the image of wolf and sheep is quite remarkable in this context. It is a well-known simile with an ancient pedigree and a consistent association with anger (see 1.2.5.4 above). Nevertheless, it is a simile normally applied to an individual who represents a danger to a group of others, be they hapless opponents in battle or society at large. Hartmann subtly inverts the image, for although he compares the populace to the wolf in temperament, they most obviously resemble the sheep in numbers. Iwein consequently emerges as a rather emasculated wolf surrounded by demented sheep.<sup>152</sup> His powerlessness in the face of such superior numbers is finally confirmed by Lunete:

nu ist vor der tür ein michel diet:  
diu ist iu starke erbolgen.  
irn wellent mir volgen,  
sô habt ir den lîp verlorn. (1488-91)

Hartmann presents the populace's anger as completely ineffectual, but the absence of overt criticism allows it to appear as a natural reaction to the death of Askalon. Only the image of wolf and sheep points to the risibility of the situation, but it is an image that makes Iwein's position seem just as ludicrous as that of the populace.

## 2.2.7 Lunete

Lunete's anger is mentioned on two occasions.<sup>153</sup> The first instance occurs when Iwein tries to rush out and console the grieving Laudine at Askalon's funeral. Lunete restrains and reprimands him, pointing out that the hostile crowd will surely kill him, and we are told 'alsus erwant in ir zorn' (1492). She then proceeds to lecture him about the

<sup>152</sup> The inversion of prey and predator occurs again later, when the lion is described lying next to Iwein 'niuwan als ein ander schâf' (4817). Iwein's position appears equally preposterous even if the simile is taken purely at face value, see Lewis 1974: 58: 'Der Dichter sieht Iwein dabei indirekt als Schaf und verdeutlicht so seine augenblickliche Situation des hilflosen Ausgeliefertseins gegenüber den wölfischen Häschern.' However, I know of no other instance where the wolf/sheep simile is applied to a single sheep surrounded by a pack of baying wolves. I would contend that, in normal circumstances, a knight surrounded by townsfolk would be more readily associated with the wolf.

<sup>153</sup> I discount the scene in which Lunete (in *Yvain*, an unnamed maiden) arrives at Artus's court to upbraid Iwein for failing to return to Laudine within a year. Some critics have interpreted Lunete's speech as a symptom of anger, e.g. Carne 1970: 101: 'Dadurch, daß Hartmann sie zur Sendbotin Laudines an den Artushof macht, tritt sie mit der Macht der Richterin auf, die voll gerechten Zorns Anklage und Urteil spricht (V. 3111-3196).' The text makes no reference to *zorn*, nor is Lunete's speech accompanied by any gestures that would indicate it. I would suggest rather that Hartmann presents this incident as an example of justice being dispensed *without* anger, at least in Lunete's case. This would be in line with the philosophy espoused by, for example, John of Salisbury (see 1.7 above).

necessity of using reason to govern folly (1499-1506).<sup>154</sup> Her *zorn* therefore appears in a positive, corrective light, preventing the hero from an act of foolishness.<sup>155</sup>

The second reference to Lunete's anger occurs when she explains to Iwein how she has been unjustly condemned for treachery and is due to be executed on the following day if she cannot find a knight to champion her cause against three opponents. She explains that this situation arose because 'ich armiu verlorne / vergâhte mich mit zorne' (4139f.), and how she had boasted of finding a knight who would challenge the three most valiant men at court 'durch mînen zorn' (4146). She emphasizes the folly of her actions with reference to well-known proverbial wisdom (see 2.2.1 above):

wan daz ist gar der sælden slac,  
swer sînem zorne niene mac  
getwingen, ern überspreche sich.  
leider alsô tet ich mich. (4141-44)<sup>156</sup>

The problem here is that this apparent foolhardiness is not consistent with the image of Lunete as a wise and level-headed counsellor that emerges from her discussions with Laudine (see 2.2.1 above) or from her earlier use of anger to save Iwein from Askalon's men, where she specifically counsels Iwein to let reason govern folly.

This contradiction is already inherent in *Yvain*, where Chrétien's Lunete justifies her offer to have her champion fight three opponents as a moment's aberration, brought on by terror: 'Si respondi come esfree / Tot maintenant sanz consoil prandre' (3680f.) and adds that the steward was not enough of a gentleman to refuse the challenge (3684f.).<sup>157</sup> The fact that Hartmann makes less effort to justify Lunete's actions perhaps bears witness to the destructive potential of *zorn*, which is able to overcome even the wisest counsellor.

## 2.2.8 Laudine

When Erec meets Enite, she is young, beautiful and unmarried. There are constant references to her extreme beauty and its siren-like effect on men that she meets. As they

<sup>154</sup> This *sententia* has its origins in *Yvain* 1322-26 (Weise 1910: 23 and 65, no. 94). It is another of the string of sayings centred on *vrûmekheit* and *êre*, as listed by Eikermann (1998: 82, fn. 34). Although *Yvain* 1322 a,b,c,d are only found in MSS H and P, they are nonetheless considered to be genuine (Reid 1942: 197; Woledge I (1986): 107).

<sup>155</sup> In *Yvain*, by contrast, there is no mention of anger. Instead, Chrétien seems to be at pains to stress the discretion with which Lunete handles the situation (1305-08).

<sup>156</sup> The importance of controlling one's anger is also stressed by Thomasin (see 1.6.2 above): 'swer volget dem zorn, spricht unde tuot / daz in dar nâch niht dunket guot. / dâ von sol man sich wol bewarn / daz man sînn zorn niht lâz volvarn' (DWG 673-76).

ride to Artus's court after Erec's defeat of Iders, there is a palpable physical attraction between the couple and, after the wedding, they devote their waking hours entirely to eating, lovemaking, and attending mass. The subsequent *Âventiurefahrt* provides the opportunity for Enite to demonstrate her total subservience to Erec as she constantly places his safety above her own and, at the point where it seems that Erec is dead, having been foiled in her attempt to commit suicide, she determines to provoke Oringles into killing her, such is her devotion to her supposedly dead spouse and her determination to remain true to him. Enite is constantly on the receiving end of *zorn*, whether from Erec or from one of the rival contenders for her affection. Only at the point where she believes Erec to be dead is there even a trace of frustration.

There has been little support for suggestion (Cramer 1972) that Enite's marriage above her station might form a basis for guilt and therefore justify her apparent punishment during the *Âventiurefahrt*. Nevertheless, his observation that Erec's marriage to a penniless girl would have been quite out of keeping with contemporary marriage practice remains extremely valuable. Enite is a figure of male fantasy, so beguiling that even modern male critics have rushed in their droves to defend her. By contrast, Laudine represents something of a challenge.

Unlike Enite, Laudine is already a widow and a queen when Iwein meets her. Far from spurning all other men, within days of her husband's death she marries his killer. Furthermore, right up to their reconciliation at the end of the text, there is only a short 'honeymoon period' between their marriage and his departure with Gawein when Iwein is not the object of Laudine's *zorn*. However, where Erec's *zorn* towards Enite ultimately has an integrative effect, leading to the restoration of the married couple to the pinnacle of courtly society, Laudine's *zorn* is presented in a more ambivalent light. Its immediate effect is destructive, causing Iwein's madness and attempted suicide, but it is ultimately corrective, motivating Iwein to reclaim his place in society through a series of altruistic acts of heroism.

Laudine's anger is directed towards God, Iwein, and Lunete, and will be examined in each of these three contexts.

---

<sup>157</sup> See Woledge II (1988): 12 on *Yvain* 3674-77 (WF 3680-83), where he states 'Il faut donc que Lunete agisse de façon peu caractéristique: oubliant le sang-froid et le bon sens qui lui sont habituels, elle a parlé sans réfléchir.'

### 2.2.8.1 Askalon's Funeral Procession

As Askalon's bier is being carried to the minster for the funeral service, the dead man's wounds begin to bleed, signalling the presence of his killer. Prompted by Laudine's outcry, her *gesinde* renew their search for Iwein, and we are told: 'Ze gote huop diu vrouwe ir zorn' (1381).<sup>158</sup> This parallels the situation in *Erec* after Erec's apparent death (see 2.1.3 above): 'vrouwe Ênîte zurnte vaste an got' (*Erec* 5774).<sup>159</sup> The effect is to create a contrast between Laudine and Enite. Whereas Enite's lengthy speeches (*Erec* 5775-6109) are directed entirely towards securing her own death and culminate in her attempt to commit suicide, Laudine's much shorter speech (1382-402) simply blames God for allowing Askalon to be killed by an invisible spirit. Whereas Enite appears to be on the brink of *desperatio* (see 1.3.4 and 2.1.3 above), Laudine is apparently simply frustrated in her attempt to take revenge. In both texts, Laudine later expresses a wish to die with Askalon (*Yvain* 1602-04; *Iwein* 1462-65; 1814f.), but Hartmann's Laudine is well aware that suicide is not an option (1890-98).<sup>160</sup>

### 2.2.8.2 Laudine and Iwein

Laudine's *zorn* towards Iwein can be divided into two separate episodes. The first episode derives from Iwein's victory over Askalon. As the killer of her husband, Iwein automatically becomes the mortal enemy of Laudine and her people. In this context, *zorn* is the public expression of the *haz* that now exists between them.<sup>161</sup>

The irony of a man falling in love with his mortal enemy is not lost on either Chrétien or Hartmann.<sup>162</sup> Thus, *vrou Minne* overwhelms Iwein to the extent:

daz er herzeminne  
truoc sîner vîendinne,  
diu im ze tôde was gehaz. (1541-43)<sup>163</sup>

<sup>158</sup> The situation is very similar in *Yvain*, but there is no reference to Laudine directing her anger towards God and no intertextual reference to other works. Instead, Chrétien stresses Laudine's extreme grief (1203-05).

<sup>159</sup> It also recalls the point at which Gregorius realizes that, like his parents before him, he has committed incest (*Gregorius* 2608).

<sup>160</sup> This passage is without precedent in *Yvain* and is not without irony. Hartmann clearly knew the story of Pyramus and Thisbe, since the Old French version appears to have been one of his sources for Enite's lament (see 2.1.3 above). Pyramus kills himself because he thinks that a lion has killed Thisbe. Thisbe then kills herself when she finds Pyramus's dead body. Enite follows this pattern when she finds Erec apparently dead, but when Iwein appears to be dead ('tôtvar', 3942), it is the lion who attempts to kill himself (3950-56). Neither Askalon's death nor Iwein's absence prompts Laudine to attempt suicide. By comparison, the lion, a mere irrational beast, appears more devoted to Iwein.

<sup>161</sup> For the historical reality of mortal enmity and *odium*, see Bartlett 1998 and Smail 2001.

<sup>162</sup> This antithesis between *amors* and *haine*, *minne* and *haz* is explored again in the relationship between Iwein/Yvain and Gawein/Gauvain, at the point where they meet in single combat (see 2.2.9.4 below).

After Askalon's funeral, we are told that *Minne* never had greater power over a man (1607f.) as Iwein asks himself:

wer gît mir sô starke sinne  
daz ich die sô sêre minne  
diu mir zem tôde ist gehaz? (1611-13)<sup>164</sup>

It is Laudine's mortal hatred that prompts her *zorn*. Thus Iwein muses that if *vrou Minne* overwhelms Laudine just as she has overwhelmed him, then 'sî müese ir zorn allen lân / und mich in ir herze legen' (1636f.). In this he is proven correct, for as soon as 'diu gewaltige Minne, / ein rehtiu süenærinne / under manne und under wîbe' (2055-57) gains the upper hand with Laudine as well, she states 'weizgot ich lâze mînen zorn' (2062).<sup>165</sup>

There is only a brief honeymoon period after the wedding when Laudine and Iwein are together in apparent harmony. When Iwein persuades his wife to grant him a favour and then seeks leave to go jousting for a year, she sets the stage for a return to the earlier state of enmity between them, swearing 'beliber iht vûrbaz, / ez wære iemer ir haz' (2926-28).<sup>166</sup> When the hero then fails to meet the deadline, this is exactly what happens.

Iwein thinks of the situation simply in terms of the loss of his wife's *hulde* (3538, 3964f., 4006-10, 4216f., 5466-70, 5493).<sup>167</sup> It is Laudine herself who, oblivious to the Knight of the Lion's true identity, refers to his wife's hostility as *zornmuot* (7892).<sup>168</sup> This is reinforced by Lunete's words as she brings the Knight of the Lion before Laudine:

sîn vrouwe, diu im ist gehaz,  
gebietent ir, diu lât ir zorn:

---

<sup>163</sup> We have already been told of Iwein's secret love for his 'vîendinne' (1423). Later, he refers to Laudine as his 'tôtvîendinne' (1655).

<sup>164</sup> Compare *Yvain* 1360f., 1433f., 1450, and 1456-60.

<sup>165</sup> One is reminded again of Veldeke's *Eneasroman*, where the queen explains to Lavinia that *minne* 'sûnet selbe den zorn' (*En.* 263,39).

<sup>166</sup> Compare *Yvain* 2564-78.

<sup>167</sup> *Yvain*, by contrast, refers to his wife's 'mautalant' and 'corroz' (4591), *ire-colère* (Kleiber 1978: 360, 365 and 376).

<sup>168</sup> The French Laudine states: 'Ne taing mie por tres cortoise / La dame, qui mal cuer vos porte' (4594f.). With regard to the term 'mal cuer', see Woledge II (1988): 47f. on 4589 (WF 4595): 'Le *mal cuer*, c'est la colère et le ressentiment de Laudine.' He goes on to list some of the MS variants, including *maugrez* and *courous*.

gebietent ir, er ist verlorn. (8056-58)<sup>169</sup>

Once again, *zorn* is the public expression of enmity between Laudine and Iwein. Trapped by her oath, Laudine reluctantly accepts Iwein back as her husband, stating ‘der zorn ist mînhalp dâ hin’ (8093) and the narrator finally comments ‘sus wart versüenet der zorn’ (8136).<sup>170</sup> However, where *zorn* was previously dispelled by *minne*, here it is dispelled by subterfuge.

Laudine’s initial *zorn* towards her husband’s killer is presented as natural (2039-41), but the killing is also defensible (2042-50) and there are compelling political reasons for setting her *zorn* aside (2058-61). The influence of *minne* is mentioned in the same breath (2055-57), pointing to a happy coincidence of desire and expediency. The conquest of anger, by whatever means, is thus shown to have a positive outcome.

Laudine’s second period of *zorn* towards *Iwein* is more problematic. It is potentially justifiable on the basis of the injunction: ‘dem bæsen wis erbolgen’ (*Cato* 382) (see 1.6.1 above). The difficulty lies in the fact that Iwein is not truly *bæse*. He is *not* one of those people referred to by Gawein ‘swer ouch *dankes* missetuo’ (2736 — my emphasis). This is specifically recognized by Laudine when she views the case dispassionately, unaware of the Knight of the Lion’s true identity:

sî sprach: ‘irn sît ein bæser man  
danne ich an iu gesehen han,  
sô sît ir aller êren wert.’ (5520-22)

When she criticizes the woman who is withholding her favour from the Knight of the Lion (5471-79), Laudine is effectively criticizing herself. The only possible justification for such action, according to Laudine, is ‘grôz herzeleit’ (5478). The ending of *Iwein*, which sees Laudine accepting Iwein back, but without any great enthusiasm, suggests an irreconcilable difference of opinion between man and wife as to what constitutes sufficient *herzeleit* to justify *zorn*. Hartmann does not present an easy solution, but he does present the dangerous consequences of *zorn* in the form of Iwein’s madness,

<sup>169</sup> In *Yvain*, Lunete suggests the Knight of the Lion as a possible champion of the fountain but points out that he will not be interested ‘tant come il avra la guerre / Et l’ire et le mal cuer sa dame’ (6606f.) unless she is able to resolve the ‘mesestance’ between him and his lady (6612). See Kleiber 1978: 297, also Woledge II (1988): 163 on 6602 (WF 6612): some MSS offer the alternative reading ‘mescheance’. Finally, as she reveals the Knight of the Lion’s true identity, Lunete instructs Laudine ‘pardonez li vostre ire’ (6756), see Kleiber 1978: 274, 292 and 365.

<sup>170</sup> The image of Laudine falling at Iwein’s feet (8130f.) appears superficially to represent the restoration of order, recalling the moment when Iwein fell at her feet (2283-85). However, it must remain doubtful whether this passage actually formed part of Hartmann’s original text, since lines 8121-32 are found only in three and lines 8133-36 only in two manuscripts (MSS Bad and MSS Ba respectively). Wolff (II: 219f.) refers to this in his commentary on l. 8121, but considers the lines to be nevertheless genuine — for the contrary view, see Schröder 1997.

discussed below. He also yet again highlights one of the difficulties with proverbial wisdom: a principle that is generally sound may not always be appropriate in individual cases.<sup>171</sup>

### 2.2.8.3 Laudine and Lunete

Laudine's *zorn* towards Lunete, such as it is, coincides with the initial mortal enmity between Laudine and Iwein. As the messenger between Iwein and Laudine, attempting to bring the two together, it is almost inevitable that Lunete should attract Laudine's *zorn*. When Lunete suggests to Laudine that the man who killed Askalon must be more valiant than he was, Laudine dismisses her 'mit unsiten' (1974),<sup>172</sup> and Lunete tells Iwein that 'sine möhte dâ niht vinden / niuwan zorn unde drô' (2000f.). Meanwhile, Laudine soon regrets her harsh reaction to Lunete's suggestion:

ich möhte wol verwâzen  
mîne zornige site:  
wan dâ gewinnet niemen mite  
niuwan schande unde schaden. (2026-29)<sup>173</sup>

Ostensibly, this reflects general proverbial wisdom that anger always works to one's diasadvantage (see 2.2.1 above). However, in this case, anger is particularly inappropriate as Lunete has always served Laudine well, as she herself admits (2016f.), and the advice has been offered in good faith (2018f.). One is reminded of the advice in the *Disticha Catonis* (see 1.6.1 above): 'Servorum culpis cum te dolor urguet in iram, / ipse tibi moderare, tuis ut parcere possis' (I, 37), preserved in the German version as:

Swenne dîn gesinde dich  
erzürne, lieber sun, sô sich,  
daz dir werde iht sô gâch  
daz dich geriuwe dar nâch. (*Cato* 223-26)

Hartmann's Laudine seems to illustrate this point quite well. When Lunete subsequently suggests to Iwein that Laudine is still angry with her — 'ir ist ûf mich vaste zorn' (2225) — it is purely pretence (2218-20). Hartmann does not say why Lunete does this. If it was intended to heighten Iwein's awareness of his debt to Lunete, it does not appear

<sup>171</sup> There is a clear parallel here in Ginover's *zorn* towards Keie (see 2.2.2 above).

<sup>172</sup> See 1.2.1 above for general agitation as a symptom of *zorn*.

<sup>173</sup> In *Yvain*, by contrast, Laudine's anger is ascribed to feminine weakness: 'Bien i pert, que vos estes fame, / Qui se corroce, quant ele ot / Nelui, qui bien feire li lot' (1650-52). See Kleiber 1978: 385. Although she subsequently promises not to lose her temper (1682-85), Laudine is stung by the suggestion that Esclados's killer must be more valiant than he was (1710-16) and is accordingly reproached by Lunete for breaking that promise (1720-26). See Kleiber 1978: 262.

to achieve the desired effect.<sup>174</sup> Laudine, meanwhile, is shown to be fully aware of her actions and in control of her anger.

One might expect to find Lunete, as the advisor responsible for promoting Laudine's marriage to Iwein, subject to Laudine's *zorn* when he fails to observe the deadline set for his return, but this does not seem to be the case.<sup>175</sup> Although Lunete finds herself condemned for treason and liable to die unless she can find a champion to defend her, she ascribes her misfortune to the machinations of the steward and his brothers, who work on Laudine until 'sî nû wol übersiht / swaz mir leides geschiht' (4117f.).

The situation is quite different in *Yvain*, for Lunete tells Yvain that when he missed the deadline 'Ma dame a moi se correça' (3664).<sup>176</sup> The steward then simply exploited the situation to create 'grant corroz' (3673) between Lunete and her mistress. Once the steward and his brothers have been defeated, 's'ire li a pardonee / La dame trestot de son gre' (4568f.).<sup>177</sup> Indeed, it seems that the French Laudine has an irascible nature. When Lunete later parts from the maiden who is seeking the Knight of the Lion on behalf of the younger daughter of the Lord of Noire Espine, she declines to follow the girl further: 'Que je ne vos siurai avant, / Que ma dame a moi ne s'ireisse' (5006f.).<sup>178</sup>

It would therefore seem that Hartmann is at pains to show Laudine in control of her *zorn* and not subject to the feminine weakness and capricious irascibility of her French counterpart. This tends to underline the seriousness of her rift with Iwein after he has missed the deadline and foreshadows the uneasy truce that marks the conclusion of the poem.

### 2.2.9 Iwein

Prior to the onset of his madness, Iwein displays *zorn* on only one occasion. This is in his combat with Askalon (1010f.) and represents the *furor heroicus* that overcomes both him and his adversary (see 2.2.5 above). Iwein's madness is itself described as 'ein zorn unde ein tobesuht' (3233). After it has abated, Iwein responds with *zorn* when his lion is

<sup>174</sup> The situation is broadly similar in *Yvain* 1906-24.

<sup>175</sup> See Lofmark 1970-71 for Laudine's passivity.

<sup>176</sup> *ire-colère* (Kleiber 1978: 386).

<sup>177</sup> *ire-colère* (Kleiber 1978: 307 and 310). See also Woledge II (1988): 45f. on 4562-3 (WF 4568-9) for the way in which this sudden change of heart characterizes Chrétien's Laudine.

<sup>178</sup> *ire-colère* (Kleiber 1978: 336). There is no hint of this in *Iwein*. In his commentary on 4997-99 (WF 5005-7), Woledge II (1988): 67 states 'Lunete craint toujours la colère de Laudine' and regards this as symptomatic of the relationship between them.



injured (5418f.)<sup>179</sup> and is evidently angered by his reception at Pesme Aventure (6125, 6133). However, he is not angered when his help is sought on behalf of the younger sister ‘von dem Swarzen Dorne’, despite the maiden’s fear ‘ob mir verliuset des ich ger / mîn ungelücke ode sîn zorn’ (5992f.). Finally, after the combat between Iwein and Gawein, we are told ‘hie was zorn âne haz’ (7642). Each of these episodes will now be discussed in turn, together with the connection between the lion and anger.

### 2.2.9.1 Iwein’s Madness

After Lunete has publicly upbraided Iwein for deserting Laudine, the hero steals quietly away from the Arthurian court and we are told:

dô wart sîn riuwe alsô grôz  
daz im in daz hirne schôz  
ein zorn unde ein tobesuht. (3231-33)

The incidence of *zorn* and *tobesuht* at this point marks the onset of the physical descent of Iwein into madness, as he tears off his clothes and runs naked into the woods (3234-38). Whilst much scholarly ink has been spilt on the subject of the hero’s madness, little has been said about the significance of *zorn* in this context.<sup>180</sup>

In Chrétien’s text, Yvain is overcome by *enui* at this point, rather than anger (2780-83). His subsequent decline into madness assumes some of the characteristics of the weather. Thus, to begin with: ‘Lors li monta uns torbeillons / El chief si granz, que il forsane’ (2804f.). Then later, the Lady of Noroison vows to cure him of ‘la rage et la tanpeste’ (2950). However, his condition is overwhelmingly characterized by *rage* (2869; 2954f.; 3004f.).<sup>181</sup>

However, a reference to Yvain’s *melancolie* (3005) is of some interest, since it would appear to point to a diagnosis of *melancholia*. Indeed, analysis of the hero’s condition from a medical-historical perspective has shown that Yvain/Iwein apparently displays many of the symptoms of *melancholia*, which had a much broader meaning in

<sup>179</sup> Note that Iwein ‘lie ez ouch ân grôzen zorn’ (5402) when the lion intervenes in his fight with the steward. The phrase ‘âne zorn lân’ suggests agreement (see 1.1.1 and another example at 2391) and would not normally have much significance for an understanding of the portrayal of anger, but there is a contrast here between Iwein’s passive reaction to the lion’s involvement and his subsequent angry reaction to the lion’s injury (5418).

<sup>180</sup> Okken (1993: 324f.) draws attention to the Classical connection between anger and madness.

<sup>181</sup> *rage* often seems to be associated with love, see Tobler/Lommatzsch VIII (1971): cols. 173-78. It certainly links Yvain to other romance heroes driven mad by love, such as Lancelot and Amadas (Laharie [n.d.]: 145-67).

the Middle Ages than the term melancholy does now.<sup>182</sup> According to Constantinus Africanus, *melancholia* arises from an imbalance in the four bodily humours caused by a preponderance of black bile (Schmitt 1985: 210). Anger is specifically mentioned as one of the symptoms of *melancholia*, along with fear, sadness and general depression (Schmitt 1985: 210; Muri 1953: 33). Indeed, there is a general association of anger with bile that can be traced back to biblical sources.<sup>183</sup> It is also interesting that one of the two types of *melancholia* described by Constantinus Africanus involves a rush of black bile to the heart and stomach, whence vapours rise to the brain, causing dementia (Schmitt 1985: 210; Matejovski 1996: 42-47).<sup>184</sup> This would seem to correspond quite closely to the way that Hartmann states ‘daz im in daz hirne schôz / ein zorn unde ein tobesuht’ and would therefore appear to present us with a diagnosis of Iwein’s condition at the very outset of his madness, whereas Chrétien leaves the diagnosis of ‘la rage et la melancolie’ until the moment of cure.<sup>185</sup>

However, Hartmann’s reference to *zorn* at this point is interesting from a number of other perspectives. To begin with, the *riuwe* that leads to Iwein’s madness can be seen to arise spontaneously before Lunete’s arrival:

in begreif ein selch riuwe  
daz er sîn selbes vergaz  
und allez swîgende saz.  
er überhôrte und übersach  
swaz man dâ tete unde sprach,  
als er ein tôle wære. (3090-95)

This ‘versûmde riuwe’ (3209)<sup>186</sup> is one of the factors ‘die benâmen sînem lîbe / vil gar vreude und den sîn’ (3214f.) until it becomes ‘alsô grôz / daz im in daz hirne schôz / ein zorn unde ein tobesuht’ (3231-33). Although events follow a broadly similar course in *Yvain*, references to remorse or regret are implied rather than explicit. Thus, before Laudine’s messenger arrives, Yvain is described as meditating on his failure to keep his promise (2695-701) to the extent that he has difficulty holding back tears (2702), which

<sup>182</sup> See Schmitt 1985; Graf 1989; Schmitz 1986; Haage 1993; Matejovski 1996: 125. It should also be noted that *melancholia* had positive as well as negative associations from Antiquity onwards and that the madness of Yvain/Iwein can be seen not just as an affliction, but as a sign of the hero’s higher destiny (Blank 1998; Jaeger 1992).

<sup>183</sup> For the connection between *zorn* and *galle*, see Schmid 1996: 384-86. See also *Wiener Genesis* V.163, (Eßer 1987: 40f.): ‘von der gallen den zorn des manec man wirt florn.’ Eßer’s commentary (1987: 358-60) also traces the history of *zorn* from both a medical and a theological point of view.

<sup>184</sup> See also Hildegard of Bingen’s description, cited by Eßer (1987: 358): ‘Nam cum interdum aliquid viderit vel audierit vel cogitaverit, de quo tristiam habet, tunc etiam aliquando nebula tristitiae, quae cor eius occupavit, calidum fumum in omnibus humoribus et circa fel eius parat et fel movet, et sic ira de amorditudine fellis silenter exurgit.’

<sup>185</sup> Chrétien’s ‘torbeillons’ perhaps also represents an attempt to capture the fury of the rising vapours.

would certainly seem to imply remorse. Nevertheless, the fact that shame prevents him from bursting into tears (2703) suggests that Yvain retains his external composure more successfully than his German counterpart. Hartmann's description, on the other hand, illustrates the medieval idea of a connection between anger and *tristitia* (see 1.3.4 above).<sup>187</sup>

Hartmann's reference to Iwein falling silent 'als er ein tôle wære' (3095) is also significant. The immediate effect of madness is that Iwein runs off as 'ein tôle in dem walde' (3260). In the woods, 'sô teter sam die tôren tuont' (3268), caring only about food. Indeed, he is four times referred to as 'der tôle' during his subsequent dealings with the hermit (3294; 3295; 3309; 3320f.) until eventually 'der edele tôle / wart gelîch einem môre / an allem sînem lîbe' (3347-49). Finally, when he awakes after being anointed with Morgan's healing salve, Iwein refers to himself as a *tôle* (3555). Although Yvain is referred to as 'forsené' (2828, 2878 and 2989), this would seem simply to reflect his madness and does not characterize him as a fool. Hartmann's insistence on Iwein's resemblance to a *tôle* is in keeping with the notion that fools are characterized by anger.<sup>188</sup>

However, a further consequence of the way in which Hartmann characterizes Iwein during his madness is the creation of an analogy with the wild man that Kalogrenant and Iwein separately encounter on their way to the fountain. As 'ein tôle in dem walde' (3260), Iwein is reduced to the same level as the 'waltman' (598, 622) who displays some of the features of a 'walttôle' (440) (Okken 1993: 270). Whereas Iwein is 'gelîch einem môre' (3348), the wild man is 'einem Môre gelîch' (427). Iwein refers to the wild man that he seeks as 'den vil ungetânen man' (934) and later describes his own condition as 'sô rehte ungetânen' (3579). As a 'gebûre' (432), the wild man is a rather threatening figure (Okken 1993: 270) to whom the adjective *rûch* is applied to describe his eyebrows, moustache and chin (446; 461), whilst the newly recovered Iwein reflects that he might well be able to pass for a knight 'swie rûch ich ein gebûre sî' (3557) and

<sup>186</sup> Some of the paper MSS read 'trewe' (Wolff II: 102).

<sup>187</sup> See also Hildegard of Bingen's description at fn. 184 above.

<sup>188</sup> For the connection between anger and the fool, see 1.5.1 (Bible), 1.6.2 (Thomasin), 1.6.3 (Freidank) and 1.7 (Social Implications). It is also worth bearing in mind that, in the Middle Ages, a fool had no legal capacity to act and required a *Vormund* (Matejovski 1996: 62-66; Laharie [n.d.]: 245-47). There is thus a sense in which the madness of Yvain/Iwein is the physical representation of the hero's incapacity to rule. This would tend to support the views of Speckenbach (1998) and Matejovski (1996: 122-55), who seem to have independently reached the conclusion that Iwein's madness represents the loss of his social identity.

states ‘swie gar ich ein gebûre bin, / ez turnieret al mîn sin’ (3573f.). Indeed, the contrast between Iwein’s madness and his previous courtly existence is made explicit by the narrator:

wart er ie hövesch unde wîs,  
wart er ie edel unde rîch,  
dem ist er nû vil ungelîch.  
er lief nû nacket beider,  
der sinne und der cleider. (3356-60)<sup>189</sup>

Thus Iwein has become, like the wild man, the antithesis of a courtly knight (Milnes 1961), and like the wild man, the mad Iwein is characterized by anger (see 2.2.4 above).<sup>190</sup> In *Yvain*, the analogy between the hero and the wild man is less clear. Instead, Yvain’s ‘torbeillons’ (2804) and ‘tanpeste’ (2950) would seem to recall the ‘tanpeste’ raised by Calogreant at the fountain (433) and to create an analogy between the uncontrolled external forces of nature that threaten existence in the extra-Arthurian world and the uncontrolled internal forces that threaten Yvain’s extra-Arthurian existence.

A final aspect to be considered is the connection between Iwein’s madness and *minne*. Traditionally, a little anger was thought to be good for love (see 1.6.4 above). However, there is no evidence of a positive side to *zorn* in the context of Iwein’s madness. It is also the case that Hartmann lays less emphasis than Chrétien on the relationship between love and madness (Matejovski 1996: 126). Thus ‘der jâmer nâch dem wîbe’ (3213) is only one of a long list of things that lead to Iwein’s madness, and we are told:

doch meistert vrou Minne  
daz im ein krankez wîp  
verkêrte sinne unde lîp. (3254-56)

However, there is no further reference to Laudine or *minne* during Iwein’s madness until the point where the Lady of Narison and her two ladies in waiting come upon Iwein in the woods, when the ladies speculate that *minne* could be the cause of his malady (3405). Furthermore, Lunete’s accusations against Iwein centre firmly on a breach of *triuwe*, in its widest sense.<sup>191</sup> The removal of Laudine’s ring (3193-99), given

<sup>189</sup> The adjectives *hövesch* and *wîs* are associated with Iwein both before and after his madness (1040, 3752, 4813, 6055, 6856). However, the ultimate example of *hövescheit* is Gawein, ‘der höfschte man, / der rîters namen ie gewan’ (3037f.) and ‘an dem niht tes enschein / ezn wære hövesch unde guot’ (2698f.).

<sup>190</sup> It follows from this analogy that Iwein, like the wild man, displays some of the stereotypical signs of anger (see 1.2.1 above), which overlap to a large degree with the symptoms of *melancholia*.

<sup>191</sup> Note the repeated references to *triuwe* (3124, 3151, 3173f., 3177, 3180, 3189), *untriuwe* (3122), *triuwelôs* (3183, 3186) and *ungetriuwe* (3195). See also Speckenbach 1998: 118f.

to Iwein as ‘einen geziuc der rede’ (2946) — proof of the agreement between husband and wife — confirms the breach of trust.

The situation is rather different in *Yvain*,<sup>192</sup> where Laudine’s messenger accuses Yvain of being a false lover (2719-73) and where the ring specifically protects only a true and faithful lover (2604-13). Indeed, the ending of *Yvain* suggests that, after the reconciliation of husband and wife, Yvain at least is happier than before (6799-808).<sup>193</sup>

This contrasts with the ending of *Iwein*, where Laudine can only say ‘der eit hât mich gevangen’ (8092), although Iwein professes that the reconciliation marks his ‘vreuden ôstertac’ (8120) (Okken 1993: 388). There can, therefore, be no question that the love between Iwein and Laudine has benefited from anger, either in the form of Laudine’s anger towards Iwein, or Iwein’s ‘zorn unde tobesuht’. It should also be noted that, whilst love-sickness was one of the recognized causes of *melancholia* in the Middle Ages (Schmitt 1985: 211; Laharie [n.d.]: 122-24), it does not seem likely that either Chrétien or Hartmann intended to portray the hero as suffering from *amor hereos* (Haage 1992).

#### 2.2.9.2 The Lion

Since lions are traditionally associated with anger (see 1.2.5.2 above), it comes as no surprise that the lion is often associated with this emotion in both the French and the German texts.

The first reference to anger is to be found when the lion attempts suicide, believing Yvain/Iwein to be dead. In *Yvain*, it runs to its intended death ‘come pors aorsez’ (3524),<sup>194</sup> whilst in *Iwein*, we are told of the lion’s reaction to Iwein’s apparent death: ‘des wart in unmuote / der lewe’ (3950f.).<sup>195</sup>

Further evidence for the lion’s anger mounts gradually during the hero’s three subsequent anonymous encounters with a series of villainous opponents. Thus, when Harpin deals the hero such a mighty blow that he is bowed down over his horse (*Yvain* 4216-18; *Iwein* 5046-49), the French lion starts to bristle (*Yvain* 4219) and ‘si saut par

<sup>192</sup> See also fn. 181 for the significance of *rage*.

<sup>193</sup> The reference to Yvain having been ‘iriez’ (6802) clearly refers to *ire-douleur* (Kleiber 1978: 137).

<sup>194</sup> There are numerous variant readings for *Yvain* 3523f., see Woledge II (1988): 6 on 3517-8 (WF 3523-4). The image of the angry boar is also found in some of the variant readings of *Perceval* 6990, describing the hair of the unnamed, unpleasant-looking squire (see 3.3.4.3.1 below).

<sup>195</sup> The meaning of *unmuot* in this context is unclear, but could extend to ‘Zorn, Schrecken oder Trauer’ (Ertzdorff 1994: 296).

ire et par grant force' (4221) as it attacks the giant.<sup>196</sup> In *Iwein*, the lion's angry response is implied as we are told that it 'lief den ungevüegen man / vil unsitlîchen an' (5051f.).<sup>197</sup> Similarly, when Laudine's steward recovers from being unhorsed and rushes to join his brothers, the French lion attacks the steward 'de si grant air' (*Yvain* 4523) that the latter dies in a pool of blood (4525-37), whilst the German lion attacks him 'vil unbarmeclîchen' (5378).<sup>198</sup> Once the steward has been laid low, 'nû wart der lewe ræze' (5390) and after the lion has been wounded 'dô wart er ræzer vil dan ê' (5413), implying an increasingly frenzied attack.<sup>199</sup> However, it is the hero himself who is moved by the lion's injury to anger. Thus, in *Yvain*, when Yvain sees that the lion is wounded, 'mout a correlié / le cuer del vandre' (4550f.), whilst Hartmann is even more specific:

ouch tete dem hern Îwein wê  
 daz er den lewen wunden sach.  
 daz bescheinder wol: wander brach  
 sîne senfte gebærde,  
 von des lewen beswärde  
 gewan er zornes alsô vil  
 daz er sî brâhte ûf daz zil  
 daz sî gar verlurn ir kraft  
 und gehabeten vor im zagehaft. (5414-22)

It is at the castle of Pesme Aventure<sup>200</sup> that the lion is most visibly angry. As soon as the French lion catches sight of the two monstrous brothers, it begins to quiver (*Yvain* 5526), knowing that they plan to attack Yvain and then:

Si se herice et creste ansamble,  
 De hardemant et d'ire tranble  
 Et bat la terre de sa coe. (5531-33)<sup>201</sup>

In *Iwein*, the lion is similarly said to be scratching the ground with its long claws (6690f.), and the two giants recognize the lion's angry disposition, commenting 'uns dunket daz er uns dreu / mit sînem zornigen site' (6694f.). The lion's escape from its prison by pawing at the ground (*Yvain* 5612f.; *Iwein* 6742-49) only serves to emphasize

<sup>196</sup> See Kleiber 1978: 272. The lion's bristling mane signals its anger, just as *Ira* is often portrayed with bristling hair (see 1.3.3 above). See also Woledge II (1988): 31 on *Yvain* 4215-7 (WF 4221-3).

<sup>197</sup> MS B preserves the reading 'vil harte zorniclîchen' (5052), whilst lines 5051f. are missing in MS c (Wolff II: 146).

<sup>198</sup> Again, other readings are preserved in the various MSS. Wolff (II: 154) draws attention to MS D's reading 'unsitlîchen' 'in Anlehnung an 5052', but it should also be noted that MS b preserves the reading 'zornlîchen'.

<sup>199</sup> Ironically, the steward had originally said to Lunete 'er ist gnuoc tumpræze / der her kumt sterben durch dich' (5242f.), obviously little suspecting that he himself would fall victim to the lion's attack.

<sup>200</sup> Unnamed in *Iwein* but so called at *Yvain* 5109.

<sup>201</sup> *ire-colère* (Kleiber 1978: 269 and 298). Quivering, bristling and beating the ground with its tail are all ways in which the lion traditionally displays anger. See fn. 196 and 1.2.5.2 above.

its frenzied anger, which then finds expression in its attack on one of the villains (*Yvain* 5664-66; *Iwein* 6756-63).<sup>202</sup> From this point onwards, the lion plays no active part in the proceedings.

Although Chrétien and Hartmann afford the lion's anger similar treatment, this is not to say that the lion has exactly the same significance for both authors.<sup>203</sup> There have been many attempts to analyse the role and significance of the lion.<sup>204</sup> However, there has been less comment on the lion's anger.

The lion's reaction to the apparent death of Yvain/Iwein is a special case, since this would appear to be an instance of the *ira* that is traditionally associated with *desperatio* (see 1.3.4. above). The reception of this scene must surely also have been influenced by its obvious similarity to the attempted suicide of Enide/Enite in Chrétien's *Erec et Enide* and Hartmann's *Erec*. Since both authors evidently drew some inspiration for this first attempted suicide from the Old French *Piramus et Tisbé* (see 2.1.3 above), it is interesting that there are some aspects of the scene in *Yvain/Iwein* that appear to recall *Piramus et Tisbé* even more strongly (Okken 1993: 342 on 3923-4356). Thus, in all three works, the action takes place at a remote fountain under a tree. Furthermore, the immediately following scene in *Yvain/Iwein* involves a conversation between the hero and Lunete through a crack in the chapel wall (*Yvain* 3567; *Iwein* 4020) that surely mimics the circumstances of the conversation between the lovers in *Piramus et Tisbé* immediately before the ill-fated rendezvous at the fountain. The attempted suicide of the lion is presented by Hartmann as an example of 'rehtiu triuwe' (4005), thus recalling the actual suicides of Piramus and Tisbé out of devotion to each other.<sup>205</sup>

During the three subsequent episodes in which the lion's anger is evident, Yvain/Iwein is faced with increasingly serious challenges: firstly, he meets an opponent who is uncourtly (Harpin); secondly, he is outnumbered by otherwise normal courtly opponents (the steward and his brothers); finally, he is outnumbered by uncourtly opponents (the two giants at Pesme Aventure). The lion's anger and commitment to the

<sup>202</sup> *ire-colère* (Kleiber 1978: 317).

<sup>203</sup> In particular, it seems that the lion as a symbol of gratefulness is given much greater emphasis by Hartmann. See fn. 118 above.

<sup>204</sup> This is not the place to attempt a comprehensive study of the lion's role. The summary by Rieger (1994) of the six (or even seven) main interpretative approaches to the lion in *Yvain* may also serve as a useful guide to the interpretative possibilities in *Iwein*. Ertzdorff 1994 provides a close comparison of the lion's role in *Yvain* and in *Iwein*.

<sup>205</sup> See, for instance, the last lines of MS C of *Piramus et Tisbé* (920f.): 'Ici fenist des deus amanz. / Con lor leal amor fu granz!'

hero's cause seem to increase proportionately to the danger. Thus, the lion's traditional anger seems to be harnessed to its traditional ability to discriminate between worthy and unworthy opponents.<sup>206</sup>

All three episodes take place away from the fountain, to which the hero inadvertently returns (*Yvain* 3490f.; *Iwein* 3923-29), and away from the Arthurian court, to which he quite purposefully returns without the lion (*Yvain* 5919-24; *Iwein* 6895-906). The lion's usefulness, both as a fellow combatant and as a badge of the hero's identity, seems to be limited to the extra-Arthurian world. It has no place in the judicial combat that is to take place in the presence of Artus, who can be relied upon to uphold justice, as the younger sister of Blackthorn points out to the elder sister:

ich suoche den küneec Artûs  
und vinde ouch kempfen dâ ze hûs  
der mich vor dîner hôchvart  
durch sîn selbes tugent bewart. (5659-62)

It would therefore seem that, outside the Arthurian world, the lion provides support to Iwein as guarantor of justice, and its bestial ferocity is a necessary counterbalance to the advantages of size, strength and numbers enjoyed by the forces of evil. The lion thus encapsulates, on a larger-than-life scale, many of the qualities of lordship previously not seen in the hero: it spares the defeated and humbles the proud.<sup>207</sup>

Finally, the lion's injury moves the hero to anger (*Yvain* 4550f.; *Iwein* 5414-22), illustrating the reciprocity of their relationship.

#### 2.2.9.3 Pesme Aventure

When Iwein and the maiden who has sought him on behalf of the younger sister arrive at the castle of Pesme Aventure, they are received 'mit unsiten' (6088) and generally treated in quite the opposite way to what might normally be expected (Peil 1975: 32f.). This prompts an angry response from Iwein, who states 'verdient ich ie iuvern haz, / daz ist unwizzende geschehen' (6112f.). As he chides the townsfolk for their poor hospitality, we are told 'Nu gehôrte ein vrouwe disen zorn' (6125), and she proceeds to entreat Iwein 'niene zürnet sô sêre' (6133), explaining that the townsfolk are concerned

<sup>206</sup> Gier (1985: 191-93) traces back to Pliny the notion that the lion does not attack anyone who begs it for mercy, and suggests that this later developed into the idea that it would be fierce towards the proud but gentle towards the meek, citing a crusade song that alleges of the lion 'aus felons est fels et otrageus / Et aus humels de bon aire et piteus'. See also Hunt 1986: 70-79.

<sup>207</sup> This reflects the Virgilian ideal: 'parcere subiectis et debellare superbos' (*Aen.* VI,853) (Hunt 1986: 71-73).



that he should avoid the castle.<sup>208</sup> Iwein's anger seems here to be a reaction to a perceived slight and an attempt to assert himself as a guest worthy of better attention.<sup>209</sup>

The poor reception is repeated when Iwein encounters the gatekeeper, who admits him 'mit manegem drôworte' (6174). Iwein's reaction is 'daz was im unmære' (6176), which could imply that he is upset, but more probably implies that he brushes the gatekeeper's threats aside (McConeghy (trans.) 1984 on *Iwein* 6176). The gatekeeper is characterized throughout as a 'schalc' (6177; 6238-42) and seems not to merit any attention from Iwein, who initially does not care to respond to his threats (6183). When the gatekeeper will not give him any information about the three hundred women, we are told that Iwein:

[...] gie lachende dan,  
als der sich mittem bösen man  
mit worten niht beheften wil:  
er hete sîn rede vür ein spil. (6279-82)

Thus the gatekeeper is beneath contempt, from Iwein's point of view, and does not merit an angry reaction.<sup>210</sup>

The two giants whom Iwein has to defeat are described as each carrying a large club and wearing only body armour (6677-86). Iwein declines to dismiss his lion, stating:

ichn vüer in durch deheinen strît.  
sît ab ir mir erbolgen sît,  
von swem iu leide mac geschehen,  
daz wil ich harte gerne sehen,  
von manne ode von tiere. (6705-09)

The reference to the giants' anger completes their stereotypical description (see 1.7, 2.1.4 and 2.2.4 above). Iwein's words also suggest that any response to such aggression is legitimate.

Finally, after Iwein has defeated the two giants and declined to accept the host's daughter as his wife, he is threatened with imprisonment rather than offered thanks. Nevertheless, we are told 'der gast vertruoc den zorn wol' (6834). In *Yvain*, at least the

<sup>208</sup> See *Iwein* 6139: 'jane redent siz durch deheinen haz.' MS r preserves the reading 'durch zorn' (Wolff II: 170).

<sup>209</sup> The situation is broadly similar in *Yvain*, although Chrétien concentrates more on the crescendo of cries that the townsfolk make rather than on any unfriendly gestures (Peil 1975: 33, fn. 8). Again, a townswoman states 'Amis! de neant te corroces' (5142) and explains the situation. See Kleiber 1978: 385.

<sup>210</sup> For the significance of 'lachende' — 'hier nahe am Lachen der Verachtung' — see Huber 1998: 350f. Note that MSS *Jcdfp* preserve the reading 'sweigvnde' for 'lachende' in 6279 (Wolff II: 174). Chrétien devotes less attention to the gatekeeper, but again the situation is fundamentally the same. After the gatekeeper's 'leide semonse' (5187), *Yvain* simply passes by 'sanz response' (5188). Furthermore, in contrast to the same scene in *Iwein*, when the gatekeeper refuses to give *Yvain* any information about the three hundred ladies, there is no comment either from *Yvain* or from the narrator.

host, his wife and the inhabitants of the castle appear to be pleased with the outcome (5694-97), but Yvain is similarly threatened with imprisonment when he refuses to marry the host's daughter (5741)<sup>211</sup> and his offer to return if he can is met with scorn (5756-70).

It is truly the case that at Pesme Aventure, 'der dinge verkêret sich vil' (6663).<sup>212</sup> Iwein encounters rudeness, where one would expect courtesy, and anger, where one would expect gratitude. The situation recalls that envisaged when Iwein intervenes to save the lion from the dragon — after Iwein decides to help the 'noble beast' (3848f.), despite concerns for his own subsequent safety (3850-53), the narrator comments:

wan alsô ist ez gewant,  
als ez ouch undern liuten stât:  
sô man aller beste gedienet hât  
dem ungewissen manne,  
sô hüete sich danne  
daz ern iht beswîche. (3854-59)<sup>213</sup>

The lion is not ungrateful and Iwein is not put to the test on this issue until he arrives at Pesme Aventure. He thus proves that he is able to deal with unjustified anger and ingratitude in an appropriate way. In *Yvain*, although the situation is broadly the same, the focus on anger and ingratitude is not so sharp.

#### 2.2.9.4 Iwein and Gawein

In many ways, Hartmann's *Iwein* represents a study of *geselleschaft* or *gesellekheit* in all its various guises. It has already been noted that, in *Iwein*, 'Hartmann altered every Gawein episode in order to accentuate the complementary nature, the interdependence, of the two knights (i.e. Iwein and Gawein)' (Sinka 1981: 473). One way in which the relationship between Iwein and Gawein is characterized is by reference to the *geselleschaft* between them. Thus Iwein is referred to as Gawein's *geselle*, and vice versa.<sup>214</sup>

<sup>211</sup> See Woledge II (1988): 118 on *Yvain* 5693 ss. (WF 5699 ss.), who points out that 'le châtelain est un personnage peu sympathique' and describes how 'sa colère augmente à tel point qu'il le menace d'emprisonnement'.

<sup>212</sup> This line introduces a *sententia* about service and reward that is without precedent in *Yvain* and for which Weise (1910: 56, no. 40) cites no parallels. Eikermann (1998: 82, fn. 34) includes it in the group of *sententiae* dealing with *vrûmekheit* and *êre*.

<sup>213</sup> This is proverbial wisdom, found also at *Yvain* 3357f.: '[...] a venimeus et a felon / Ne doit an feire se mal non' (Weise 1910: 68, no. 111). Weise (1910: 26) also draws attention to the subtle difference here: 'Crestien lehrt dem Bösen nur Böses zuzufügen; Hartmann aber erinnert nur an die Undankbarkeit der Schlechten und mahnt zur Vorsicht, wenn man ihnen Gutes erwiesen habe.' The latter is precisely the situation that obtains at Pesme Aventure.

<sup>214</sup> See 2701, 2725, 2754, 2787, 3029, 3533, 4304, 6957, 7014, 7059, 7567, 7588, 7606, 7620, 7634, 7745 (also *kampfgesellen*, 7085).

Whilst there are many other characters who are described as *gesellen*, Iwein and Gawein are the only ones who enjoy ‘geselleschaft âne haz’ (2621).<sup>215</sup> It is thus ironic that they should end up facing one another in single combat, each unaware of the other’s identity, a point that Hartmann dwells on his excursus about *minne* and *haz* (7015-74).<sup>216</sup> Furthermore, the juxtaposition of *minne* and *haz* between the two *gesellen* suggests points of comparison and contrast between the relationship of the two friends and the relationship of Iwein and Laudine.<sup>217</sup> The *zorn* that characterizes the relationship between the latter couple is quite absent from the relationship between Iwein and Gawein until the very end of their single combat, when the identity of the combatants is revealed and each vies with the other to claim defeat. When Gawein eventually declares that he has been fighting on the side of injustice and insists that Iwein has won the combat (7620-35), Iwein is severely embarrassed:

daz êren er im niht vertruoc:  
wan redte er wol, sô redte er baz.  
hie was zorn âne haz. (7640-42)

Thus the ‘geselleschaft âne haz’ is also characterized by ‘zorn âne haz’. The strong implication is that nothing can come between the two friends: any disagreement is purely superficial. By contrast, in *Yvain*, when Yvain learns of Gauvain’s identity, he flings down his sword ‘Par mautalant et par corroz’ (6270), but there is no admission by Gauvain that he has espoused the wrong cause, nor is the action glossed by the narrator with any comments about ‘anger without enmity’ (Lawson (trans.): 316).

### 2.3 Conclusions

Hartmann’s Arthurian works contain examples of both positive and negative aspects of *zorn*. In both *Erec* and *Iwein*, there are individuals who lose their temper or are generally associated with *zorn* and who display physiological symptoms of anger and/or illustrate some of the cognitive aspects of anger (see 1.2.1 and 1.2.2 above). Thus Galoain and Oringles prove to be the exact opposites of Erec. Whereas Erec is able to control his anger towards Iders and also remains in control of his anger towards Enite, never once displaying any physiological symptoms or resorting to insults or violence, Galoain and Oringles quickly lose control of their anger as soon as things are not going

---

<sup>215</sup> In *Yvain*, we are simply told that Gauvain was one hundred times more pleased than anyone else with Yvain’s triumph over Keu: ‘Que sa conpaignie amoit plus / Que conpaignie, qu’il eüst / A chevalier, que il seüst’ (2288-90).

<sup>216</sup> Compare *Yvain* 5998-6105.

<sup>217</sup> Space does not permit a detailed study of this point here; see instead Margetts 1974.

their way. Galoain breaks down the door at the inn where Erec and Enite had been staying (*Erec* 4046-48), speaks to the innkeeper ‘mit zornigen siten’ (4061) and addresses Erec ‘vil unritterlîch’ and ‘mit ungezæmen grimme / nâch unvriuntlîcher stimme’ (4169-71). Furthermore, in his extreme haste to pursue Erec, Galoain wears no armour (4105-09; 4213), leaving himself vulnerable to injury. Oringles, on the other hand, is moved to insults and violence when Enite will not comply with his marriage plans (6518-25; 6577-79) and he speaks ‘unsenfteclîche’ (6539).<sup>218</sup>

In *Iwein*, the wild man has the unkempt hair and red eyes associated with Prudentius’s *Ira* (433; 445f.; 451), whilst Askalon speaks with a loud voice (701), Laudine speaks ‘mit unsiten’ (1974) and Ginover insults Kei (137-58). Laudine’s *gesinde* display the most obvious symptoms of anger, breaking down the gates and behaving in a frenzied manner as they search for Iwein, a scene which culminates in an unusual use of the well-known simile of wolf and sheep to underline the fury of the search (1258-97; 1370-80). The only other obvious symptoms of anger are reserved for Iwein’s lion, which attacks Harpin ‘vil unsitelîchen’ (5052) and the steward ‘vil unbarmeclîchen’ (5378) and becomes ‘ræze’ and ‘ræzer vil dan ê’ (5390; 5413). It is then seen pawing the ground at Pesme Aventure (6690f.) and claws its way out of captivity (6747-49) before attacking one of the giants ‘mit kreften’ (6758).

Characters who display anger are often associated with *unvuoge* or *ungevüege*. Examples include the giants who abuse Cadoc (*Erec* 5472; 5554), Galoain (4046), Oringles (6520<sup>219</sup>; 6528), the wild man (*Iwein* 444), Harpin (5051), and the two giants at Pesme Aventure (6717). Such characters are either from the fringes of society, such as the wild man and the various giants, or they are courtly characters who transgress social norms, such as Galoain and Oringles.<sup>220</sup> The conflict between *zorn* and *zuht* is also illustrated by Ginover’s angry outburst at the beginning of *Iwein*.<sup>221</sup>

<sup>218</sup> Shouting and cursing also accompany Enite’s lament (5913-38; 6072-74; 6083). There is an element of *zorn* here (5774), but overwhelming grief dominates. Mabonagrîn also shouts in a loud voice (8992-96) and greets Erec in a hostile manner (9025f.), although his loudness is at least partially accounted for because ‘im was der drozze grôz’ (8995). Erec, by contrast, is silent at the first robber’s approach (3221f.).

<sup>219</sup> Bartsch’s conjecture (Cormeau/Gärtner 1985: 220).

<sup>220</sup> For the association of giants with anger see 1.7 above. In *Iwein*, it is also possible to see a connection between *tôrheit* and *zorn*, since the wild man is like a ‘walttôr’ (440) and the mad Iwein is several times described as a *tôre* (see above). The notion that ‘anger resides in the bosom of a fool’ derives from the Bible and is a popular theme in proverbial wisdom and didactic literature (see 1.5.1 and 1.6 above).

<sup>221</sup> See especially Thomasin’s comments (*DWG* 671f.) at 1.6.2 above.

Set against such examples of uncontrolled anger are a number of cases where anger is seen to be carefully controlled. Erec himself is the most obvious example, curbing his anger towards Iders until a suitable opportunity for revenge presents itself (*Erec* 99-101; 160-73). Furthermore, he is able to simulate the consequences of giving his anger free rein, threatening to kill Iders (951-55) and sever the dwarf's hand (1052-63) in order to induce Iders to surrender and to provoke a suitable degree of contrition in the dwarf. Thus his anger is not purely punitive but takes on a corrective dimension.<sup>222</sup> His anger towards Enite is also perfectly controlled, never spilling over into violence or inappropriate behaviour. Finally, although he is angered by Kei's attempt to lead him to Artus (4686; 4704), he is able to reverse his lance at the last moment and strike Kei with the butt end (4720-27), subsequently agreeing to let Kei keep Wintwalite (4807).

The importance of controlling anger is also an issue in *Iwein*, as is made clear in some of the proverbial wisdom cited by Hartmann. However, examples are few. Laudine is able to overcome her initial anger towards Iwein after Askalon's death, but can only be tricked into abandoning her anger second time around. Askalon himself responds to Kalogrenant's incursion into his territory like a child (723-25), and even Lunete, who seems otherwise level-headed, loses her senses when accused by the steward (4141-43). The only person who truly successfully reins in her anger is the Lady of Narison. She is spontaneously angry when she discovers that all the ointment has been lost (3681), but then almost immediately concludes that 'it is no use crying over spilt milk' and abandons her anger (3691-94). There is certainly no comparison between Erec and Iwein, since control of anger is not an issue for the latter. Iwein is able to let his lion do all the dirty work, unleashing its anger on Harpin, the steward and his brothers, and the two giants at Pesme Aventure. The uncontrolled anger necessary to defeat the forces of evil and injustice is conveniently transposed to a member of the animal kingdom, of whom little is expected in the way of reason or restraint.

Sometimes anger is seen to be righteous: a response to the injustice or immoderation of the actions of others. Thus Erec's anger towards the giants who are abusing Cadoc (*Erec* 5505) seems entirely justified by their shameless behaviour, as does his anger towards Oringles (6620) as he realizes that Enite is in need of his help. Similarly, Iwein's anger at his lion's injury seems entirely justified (*Iwein* 5414-22; 5426-28).

---

<sup>222</sup> For the corrective use of anger, see 1.6.1, 1.6.2 and 1.7 (*ira per zelum*).

In both *Erec* and *Iwein*, *zorn* often functions as a symbol of authority rather than an indication of an emotional state. This is most obviously illustrated by Erec himself, whose *zorn* towards Enite is the public expression of his power over his wife. However, the point is also illustrated by Artus, whose *zorn* indicates a different kind of authority in the opening scene of *Iwein* (886) to that seen in his handling of the dispute between the two sisters (7334f.). Furthermore, the wild man's *zorn* (514) is the sign of his authority over the beasts. Similarly, in *Iwein*, *zorn* is sometimes the outward expression of mortal enmity, as is the case with Askalon's response to Kalogrenant (702) and Laudine's *zorn* towards Iwein. Alternatively, it expresses a break in social relations, as when Meljaganz storms out of Artus's court (4556f.).

The question of a link between *ira* and *tristitia/desperatio* is again raised in both works, but whereas Enite seems to be genuinely suicidal (*Erec* 5774), Laudine simply seems to be frustrated at her inability to avenge Askalon (*Iwein* 1381), and this is underlined rather pointedly by comparison with the lion's reaction to Iwein's apparent death (*Iwein* 3950-52). Iwein's 'zorn unde [...] tobesuht' (3233), on the other hand, represents a special case, for it seems that *zorn* here is a recognized symptom of *melancholia* or madness, associated with Iwein's loss of social identity.

Female anger is not an issue in *Erec* but assumes great importance in *Iwein*. The anger of Laudine, Ginover, and Lunete is problematized in *Iwein*, for it seems that none of these three principal female characters is able to moderate her anger correctly. Ginover and Laudine both demonstrate excessive *zorn* towards a member of their household (Kei and Lunete respectively), and both appear to be poor judges of character, making insufficient allowance for the redeeming features of Kei and Iwein respectively. Lunete, on the other hand, seems to be a model of calm in dealing with Iwein and Laudine, but soon oversteps the mark when her own position is threatened. Only the Lady of Narison offers a positive example, curbing her anger when her ointment is lost.

Proverbial wisdom about *zorn* is also questioned in *Iwein* in a way that it is not in *Erec*. Gawein's reaction to Erec's *zorn* (*Erec* 5068) is presented as a variant of the proverbial wisdom that 'a little anger is good for love', but there is no suggestion that this sentiment applies in *Iwein*, where Laudine's *zorn* brings Iwein only madness and

misery, although it also motivates him to perform acts of altruism.<sup>223</sup> Although anger can be corrective, as illustrated by Lunete's *zorn* towards Iwein (*Iwein* 1492), the application of the principle that anger can profitably be used to correct another's misdeeds (2736-38) is shown to be fraught with problems, since neither Kei nor Iwein is truly deserving of the treatment he receives. The notion that following good advice is the way to avoid trouble and strife (*Iwein* 2153-58) is also shown to be an oversimplification: Laudine follows Lunete's reasoned advice to marry Iwein, but this rebounds on Lunete as the advisor when Iwein fails to return on time from his jousting activities. Artus, on the other hand, is convinced by his advisors that he should accede to Meljaganz's demand, only to discover that his instinct to refuse would have been better. Later, he eschews all advice about settling the sisters' dispute, to good effect. The truest sentiments are those that point to the unfortunate consequences of failing to control one's anger — both Laudine and Lunete have occasion to regret their anger (*Iwein* 2026-29; 4141-43).<sup>224</sup>

There are four cases where *zorn* simply represents *furor heroicus*: Erec's combats against Iders (*Erec* 760), Galoain (4207), and Mabonagrín (9081f.), and Iwein's combat with Askalon (*Iwein* 1010f.). These are all combats between members of the nobility and, in each case, both parties are afflicted with *zorn* in equal measure. In Iwein's combat with Gawein, there is no mention of *zorn* on the field of combat, but as soon as they vie with each other for the privilege of losing the contest, we are told 'hie was zorn âne haz' (7642), thus underlining the difference between this war of words and the deadly earnest of combat.

In *Erec*, *güete* is identified as the principal antidote to *zorn* and is particularly associated with Enite, Erec and Gawein. Enite deliberately uses this quality to assuage Galoain's anger (3838-44), but it is her natural *güete* that enables her to endure Erec's anger and that shines through in the end. The giants who abuse Cadoc demonstrate their lack of courtliness by their failure to respond to Erec's *güete* — in fact this increases their *zorn* (5489-93). Kei, on the other hand, abuses this concept in his attempt to trick

---

<sup>223</sup> Erec and Enite's relationship seems to be unaffected by his *zorn* towards her. He asks her forgiveness and she immediately grants it (*Erec* 6795-803). The ending simply implies that they lived happily ever after (10107-14). The principle that anger can profitably be used to test a lover is established by Andreas Capellanus and seems applicable to the case of Erec and Enite, but does not seem to have any relevance for Iwein and Laudine. See 1.6.4 above.

<sup>224</sup> Note Thomasin's comments about anger leading to words and actions that are later regretted (see 1.6.2 above).

Erec into following him into Artus's court, thus igniting Erec's anger (4700-04).

In *Iwein*, by contrast, *güete* is most strongly associated with peripheral characters who have no active role. Thus it is associated with the girl and her father who receive Kalogrenant and Iwein on their way to the fountain (341; 343; 358; 362), the two daughters of the host who accommodates Iwein and his wounded lion (5618), and the daughter of the host at Pesme Aventure (6467; 6496; 6508). These are iconographic, idealized figures who are unsullied by any serious involvement in the action of the story.

Nevertheless, it is clear that Hartmann has not lost all interest in *güete* in *Iwein*. Laudine's 'stæte güete' at Askalon's graveside (1602; 1661) is one of the things that attracts Iwein to her. When she subsequently initially rejects the idea of finding someone to replace Askalon, Hartmann puts this down to contrariness, which he ascribes to female *güete* (1878). This quality is not directly associated with Laudine again, but since we are told that 'übel gemüete' can easily be converted to 'güete', but not the other way round (1879-82), we are probably meant to think that Laudine is fundamentally good, even if her anger towards Iwein during the second half of the story is questionable.

Another pointer to the continuing importance of *güete* is its appearance in the opening lines of *Iwein*:

Swer an rehte güete  
wendet sîn gemüete,  
dem volget sælde und êre. (1-3)

The resemblance of these lines to a passage from the *Der deutsche Cato* (see 1.6.1 above) is striking:

Swer hât gedultige site  
dem volget êre und sælde mite:  
du überwindest mêr mit güete  
dan mit zorn und ungemüete. (227-30)

This could almost be the 'moral of the story' for Hartmann's Arthurian romances. Enite, Erec and Gawein show this principle in action in *Erec*, whilst *Iwein* illustrates what can happen when *zorn* is given free rein.



### Chapter 3: *Parzival*

#### 3.0 Introduction

*Zorn* is an important theme in *Parzival* and is to be found in every part of the poem. However, it is convenient to consider it in four different contexts: the story of Gahmuret (4,27-112,4), the story of Parzival (112,5-114,4; 116,5-337,30; 433,1-502,30; 679,1-827,30), the story of Gawan (298,1-432,30; 503,1-731,30), and the story of the narrator, which frames the other three. Although there is some overlap between these four contexts, they can nevertheless be considered in isolation from each other and there are useful insights to be obtained from comparison between them.

#### 3.1 The Gahmuret Story (4,27-112,4)

Books I and II of *Parzival* have no parallel in Chrétien's *Le Conte du Graal* and Wolfram's sources for this part of the work remain obscure (Nellmann 1994, II: 454 on 4,27-112,4).<sup>1</sup> *Zorn* is in evidence at both Patelamunt and Kanvoleis, although it is not a dominant theme.

##### 3.1.1 Patelamunt

At Patelamunt, Belakane is besieged by 'manegen zornigen gast' (25,18), prompting Gahmuret to enquire why she is being visited thus 'zornlîche mit gewalt' (26,5). Not one of the gates has been barred 'sît wurde gerochen Isenhart / an uns mit zorn' (30,14f.), and Isenhart's men 'ringent mit zorne' (30,21). Revenge for loss of kin is the primary motivation for the attackers.<sup>2</sup> The intensity of the *zorn* seems to reflect the intensity of the 'desire for revenge' that it characteristically accompanies (see 1.2.2 above).

##### 3.1.2 Lahfilirost

Lahfilirost's anger is prompted by Gaschier's surrender and is described in particularly colourful terms:

daz er niht îsen als ein strûz  
und starke vlinse verslant,  
daz machte daz err niht envant.  
sîn zorn begunde limmen

<sup>1</sup> The question of sources for Books I and II has been dealt with most extensively by Panzer 1940 and, more recently, by Noltze (1995: 247-58). It should be noted, however, that some of Panzer's findings are in need of revision.

<sup>2</sup> This is made clear at the outset, when Isenhart's death in the service of Belakane is first mentioned: 'Den râchen sîne mâge' (16,11).

und als ein lewe brimmen.  
dô brach er ûz sîn eigen hâr. (42,10-15)<sup>3</sup>

Both the ostrich and the lion have traditional associations with anger (see 1.2.5.5 and 1.2.5.2 above respectively), and the gesture of tearing the hair emphasizes that anger is in play (see 1.2.1 above). However, for all its vibrant imagery, Lahfilirost's *zorn* is not directed at anyone or anything else. The use of such extravagant imagery seems to indicate Lahfilirost's exaggerated concern for Gahmuret, who is a guest in his town, and has a humorous effect.

### 3.1.3 Kanvoleis

When Herzeloide arranges a tournament, offering herself and her two kingdoms as the prize (60,9-17), the fighting is so fierce that the tournament proper never gets under way and has to be abandoned after the *vesperîe* (95,14-19).<sup>4</sup> The description of the fighting makes it clear that it is characterized by reckless aggression:

si geloubten sich der sliche,  
die man heizet friwendes stiche:  
heinlich gevaterschaft  
wart dâ zefuort mit zornes kraft. (78,5-8)

'Staunch friendships' (Hatto (trans.) 1980: 50) are wantonly destroyed and irreparable damage is done, with no heed to the feelings of others.

Gahmuret's exploits (78,17-79,5) provoke an angry response from Lâhelîn — 'do begunde zürnen Lâhelîn' (79,13), resulting in the latter's ignominious defeat (79,25f.), but the consequences of this are barely considered.<sup>5</sup> It is left to the audience/reader to decide whether Lâhelîn's later actions, specifically his invasion of Gahmuret's lands after the latter's death, could be connected to this event (see 3.2.1.2 below).

Gahmuret is not singled out for special emphasis in the context of *zorn*. Indeed, from the moment that he sees his brother's arms inverted (80,6-18), Gahmuret is characterized by *jâmer* (80,22; 84,16; 90,11), *kumber* (80,30; 90,13) and *klage* (81,5), and appears *unfrô* (85,11). This prompts an angry response from Kaylet: 'dô zurnde

<sup>3</sup> Compare Morolt's reaction in Eilhart's *Tristrant*, MS H: 'dú rede tet im ser zorn / er begund brinnen ser so ain horn, / daß blâsset ser / in ainem grössen her' (*Tristrant* H 737-40).

<sup>4</sup> For more details on the *vesperîe*, see Bumke 1986: 351f.

<sup>5</sup> It is, however, possible that the narrator's unease about Lâhelîn's defeat is conveyed by the lines 'doch læse ich samfter süeze birn, / swie die ritter vor im nider rirn' (80,1f.). This would not necessarily conflict with Nellmann's comment (1994, II: 499): 'Der Erzähler stellt sich — im Gegensatz zum Autor (115,11ff.) — gern als wenig heldenhaft dar.' The reference to gathering ripe pears has not been satisfactorily explained.

sîner muomen suon' (90,15), who thus warns Gahmuret against sinking into *tristitia* (see 1.3.4 above).<sup>6</sup> In fact, the fury of the fighting rages on in Gahmuret's absence:

Die andern tæten rîterschaft  
mit sô bewander zornes kraft,  
daz siz wielken vaste unz an die naht. (82,5-7)

This scene at Kanvoleis shows *zorn* as the passion fanning the flames of battle to deadly effect, a theme that will recur later at Bearosche (see 3.3.2 below). Furthermore, Gahmuret's encounter with Lâhelin touches on another important aspect of *zorn*: it is a reaction to the loss, or threatened loss, of honour (79,13-18). This reaction will subsequently characterize Lâhelin's brother, Orilus (see 3.2.1.2 below), and fuels the impulse to exact revenge for wounded honour just as it fuelled the impulse to exact revenge for loss of kin at Patelamunt.

### 3.1.4 Hardiz

After the hostilities at Patelamunt are over, Gahmuret jokes with Kaylet about Hardiz, King of Gascony, 'der iu dicke tuot mit zornes gir' (48,11). Here 'mit zornes gir' seems to indicate a state of enmity between Hardiz and Kaylet.<sup>7</sup> The details of this become clearer, but are never fully explained, when Kaylet and Gahmuret meet again at Kanvoleis.<sup>8</sup> On learning of Gahmuret's presence, Kaylet has high hopes of bringing Hardiz to heel:

der stolze küneec Hardîz  
hât mit zorne sînen vlîz  
nu lange vaste an mich gewant:  
den sol hie Gahmuretes hant  
mit sîner tjoste neigen. (65,5-9)

Hardiz is numbered by Kaylet among the outers 'Die sint mit zorne hie gein mir' (67,29), and it is not unlikely that the fierce fighting at Kanvoleis is in fact attributable to the antagonism between these two men. It emerges that Hardiz's sister, Alize, once offered Kaylet love (89,8f.), but that she is now married to Lambekin, Duke of Brabant and Hainault (89,13). Although Kaylet makes out that she is better off, despite the loss

<sup>6</sup> The importance of keeping grief within acceptable bounds is later stressed by Trevrizent (489,2-4).

<sup>7</sup> Nellmann (1994, II: 479) on 48,8-12 suggests that there was an earlier liaison between Kaylet and Hardiz's sister and states 'im Zusammenhang damit muß es Streit gegeben haben'.

<sup>8</sup> Noltze (1995: 174) on 48,11 weighs up two possible interpretations: a) some time before Hardiz had promised Alize to Lambekin, Alize instigated a relationship with Kaylet which was frustrated by political considerations; or b) Kaylet abandoned Alize. As Noltze points out, only the second interpretation provides a clear motivation for Hardiz's hostility and this is the interpretation I am inclined to accept.

in social rank (89,10f.; 89,14-17),<sup>9</sup> his later comment to Hardiz ‘ir möht iuch nu wol hân verschemt’ (90,4) suggests that Hardiz may have suffered, or imagined he suffered, a loss of honour, and that this may be the motivating force behind Hardiz’s *zorn*.<sup>10</sup>

There is an interesting parallel here between Alize and Jeschute. Like Alize, Jeschute is the sister of a king (Erec) but marries a duke (Orilus). When he first suspects Jeschute of having willingly submitted to Parzival’s advances, Orilus accuses her as follows:

frouwe, ich hân iu niht getân:  
irn welt iuch einer site schamn:  
ir liezet küneginne namn  
und heizt durch mich ein herzogin. (133,30-134,3)

Orilus goes on to tell of continuing rivalry between himself and Erec, Jeschute’s brother (134,5-19), and then makes a connection to Books I and II by alluding to the death of Galoes (134,23-26). Kaylet is in a different position to Orilus, but both men find themselves at odds with the brother of their lover.<sup>11</sup> At any rate, Kaylet is keen to reach some kind of accommodation with Hardiz, perhaps fearing that Gahmuret may not be on hand to bail him out another time:

durch iwer zuht lât zornes gir (89,12)  
[. . .]  
kêrt mir ze grüezen iweren muot,  
lât mich in iweren hulden sîn,  
und nemt hin widr den dienst mîn. (89,18-20)

The setting aside of *zornes gir* will evidently lead to a resumption of *grüezen*, *hulden* and *dienst*, i.e. a normal courtly relationship. Thus the socially disruptive potential of *zorn* is emphasized. Hardiz is not unduly impressed by Kaylet’s blandishments, but as the captive of Kaylet’s cousin, his bargaining position is weak (89,21-27). Kaylet promises to put in a good word for him (89,29f.), but there is no further talk of the problem until after Gahmuret’s wedding night with Herzeloyde. At this point Gahmuret

<sup>9</sup> Both Nellmann (1994, II: 527) on 134,3 and Yeandle (1984: 359) on 134,2f. point to the fact that a woman who marries beneath her social status assumes the lower rank.

<sup>10</sup> There may also have been territorial and/or political implications, since Alize’s marriage to Kaylet would have forged an alliance between Gascony and Spain, whereas her marriage to Lambekin creates an alliance between Gascony and Hainault/Brabant (89,16). Noltze (1995: 174) on 48,11 refers to Margaret Richey’s suggestion of a border dispute between Gascony and Spain.

<sup>11</sup> In this context, Orilus’s reference to himself as Jeschute’s *âmis* at 133,10 — ‘ir habt ein ander âmis’ — has the effect of heightening the parallel with Kaylet. Brothers often become entangled in the love-affair of a sister in *Parzival*: other examples are furnished by Vergulaht (in conflict with Gawan) and Gawan (in conflict with Gramoflanz). In the latter examples, rank is not an issue and the sister’s love-affair is not the prime cause of the conflict, nevertheless, the cumulative effect is to emphasize the potential tensions engendered by amorous liaisons.

frees all his captives and the narrator specifically states: ‘Hardîzen und Kaylet, / seht, die versuonde Gahmuret’ (100,21f.). As one of Gahmuret’s first acts upon assuming control both of his own ancestral territory and of Herzeloyde’s lands, the business of assuaging *zorn* is thus an important aspect of kingship.<sup>12</sup>

### 3.1.5 Ampflise’s Envoys

Ampflise’s envoys arrive at Kanvoleis to present their lady’s suit to Gahmuret (76,1-77,18). After his success on the field, they vigorously oppose Herzeloyde’s claim on Gahmuret (87,7-88,6), but when judgement has been pronounced in Herzeloyde’s favour and Gahmuret rejects their final approach (97,13-98,6), they depart unceremoniously:

Er bôt in sîne grôze habe:  
sîner gebe tâten si sich abe.  
die boten fuorn ze lande  
gar ân ir frouwen schande.  
sine gerten urloubes niht,  
als lîhte in zorne noch geschiht.  
ir knappen fürsten, disiu kint  
wârn von weinen vil nâch blint. (98,7-14)

By declining Gahmuret’s gifts and departing without taking leave, Ampflise’s envoys publicly demonstrate a break in social relations between themselves (on behalf of Ampflise) and Gahmuret.<sup>13</sup> This is an example of *zorn* as the manifestation of hostility through well-defined patterns of behaviour.<sup>14</sup> Furthermore, the phrase ‘als lîhte [...] noch geschiht’ suggests a contemporary relevance which is reinforced by subsequent narratorial comments on *zorn*.<sup>15</sup>

### 3.1.6 Conclusions

Several aspects of *zorn* that assume great importance for *Parzival* as a whole are foreshadowed in Books I and II. Thus both Patlamunt and Kanvoleis provide examples of *zorn* as the ‘desire of retaliation’ (see 1.2, especially 1.2.2 above). At Patlamunt, the motivating force for the besieging armies is the desire to avenge the loss of kin

<sup>12</sup> This aspect is developed further in the story of Gawan and is ultimately epitomized by Artus’s role in engineering the reconciliation between Orgeluse and Gramoflanz and between Gramoflanz and Gawan (729,16-20).

<sup>13</sup> The gesture of weeping is ambivalent, but is here a symptom of *zorn* (see 1.2.1 above).

<sup>14</sup> Cundrie la surziere departs from the Plimizoel ‘ân urloup’ (318,26), as does Meljanz from Bearosche after Obie has rejected his suit (347,5). Both characters are associated with *zorn* (see below).

<sup>15</sup> Compare ‘in zorne wunders vil geschiht’ (152,13) and ‘Von minn noch zornes vil geschiht’ (366,1). Reuter (1993: 182-85) describes a dispute between the Bishop of Cambrai and the Count of Flanders in 1152 during which the Count was ‘about to return home in anger’, signalling his intention to resort to feud to resolve the issue.

(Isenhart), whilst at Kanvoleis, individuals such as Lähelin and Hardiz are motivated by the desire to avenge a perceived loss of honour.

In both engagements, *zorn* represents the intense aggression that can arise from this desire. At Kanvoleis, the fighting reaches a particularly murderous intensity before the tournament proper has even begun and can in no way be described as a friendly contest. The dispute between Kaylet and Hardiz hints at the power of *zorn* to destroy relationships and to fan the flames of discord.

The reaction of Ampflise's envoys to the bad news that Gahmuret is to marry Herzeloide, rather than their mistress, is a classic example of *zorn* as the public manifestation of a breakdown in social relations. Similarly, Kaylet's anger (90,15) is a straightforward example of *zorn* being used correctively and constitutes an implicit warning against *tristitia*. At the opposite end of the spectrum, Lahfilrost's anger is nothing short of comical and shows Wolfram using well-known imagery to humorous effect.

What emerges above all is the importance of *suone*, which is effectively the setting aside of *zorn* and *haz*. When he enters the fray at Kanvoleis, Gahmuret is wearing Isenhart's armour, which Vridebrant had sent to Belakane as a peace-offering (70,13-15). We never find out whether Belakane and Vridebrant buried the hatchet, despite the fact that Gahmuret had promised to deliver Vridebrant's message (58,17-19). His failure to keep this promise seems like culpable omission.

We are told of Gahmuret at an early stage that 'strît und minne was sîn ger' (35,25). His departure from Patlamunt was motivated by the urge to fight: 'daz er niht rîterschefte vant, / des was sîn freude sorgen phant' (54,19f.), and this receives special emphasis when he agrees to marry Herzeloide on condition that he can continue to fight in tournaments (96,25-97,10).<sup>16</sup> Wolfram describes how Gahmuret exercises his right to attend tournaments (101,7-20), then moves seamlessly to the fateful trip to the East (101,21-102,22). Gahmuret's lifestyle maintains him in a constant state of mental and physical combat-readiness: it is a lifestyle in which the concept of *suone* does not play an important part.

Gahmuret is not unaware of the king's role as a peacemaker, as demonstrated by his reconciliation of Hardiz and Kaylet. However, he is committed to a personal lifestyle

that perpetuates conflict and he is ultimately a victim of the cyclical violence engendered by the ‘desire of retaliation’. This can be seen in the events leading up to his death, when the Baruc’s seizure of Niniveh prompts a hostile response from the brothers Ipomidon and Pompeius.<sup>17</sup> Furthermore, Gahmuret’s defeat of Ipomidon at Alexandria specifically motivates the latter to kill him (106,7-11). *Zorn* emerges as a destructive force that fans the flames of such violence and as a barrier to peace, potentially threatening both social and political stability.

### 3.2 The Parzival Story(112,5-114,4; 116,5-337,30; 433,1-502,30; 679,1-827,30)

Despite Wolfram’s protestations that Kyot, rather than Chrétien, supplied him with the true story of Parzival (453,11-455,22; 827,1-14), there seems little doubt that Chrétien’s unfinished *Conte du Graal* served as his principal source.<sup>18</sup> Comparison is impossible beyond the point at which Gauvain’s messenger arrives at the Arthurian Court, where Chrétien’s text breaks off (*Perceval* 9234). We cannot therefore be certain what fate Chrétien had in store for Perceval. Nevertheless, comparison between the two texts reveals many illuminating differences.

#### 3.2.1 Parzival’s Rise to Fame

##### 3.2.1.1 Parzival’s Youth

Parzival shows a susceptibility both to compassion and to anger at an early stage, when he is moved by the death of the birds that he has shot: ‘sô weinder unde roufte sich, / an sîn hâr kêrt er gerich’ (118,9f.).<sup>19</sup> However, his first brush with the *zorn* of others comes in the forest of Soltane, when he encounters three knights on horseback and we are told ‘der vorder zornes sich bewac / dô der knappe im phade lac’ (121,3f.).<sup>20</sup> This is an example of *zorn* resulting from impatience (see 1.3.3 above), as the first knight

<sup>16</sup> Although tournaments were undoubtedly popular and afforded the participants every opportunity to demonstrate their prowess and impress others, they also served as training grounds for necessary military skills (Bumke 1986: 365f.).

<sup>17</sup> When the brothers are first named, we are told ‘den nam der bâruc Ninivê / (daz was al ir vordern ê)’ (14,5f.). The impact on the brothers of the loss of Niniveh becomes even clearer later: ‘die gebrüoder wâr von hôher art, / von Nînus, der gewaldes pflac / ê wurde gestiftet Baldac. / der selbe stift ouch Ninnivê’ (102,10-13). Thus the Baruc has deprived the brothers of their birthright.

<sup>18</sup> See Bumke 1991: 156-59, also Nellmann 1994, II:651, 664f., and 789 on 416,20-30, 453,5-455,22, 453,11 and 827,3-5, and Hatto (trans.) 1980: 427-29.

<sup>19</sup> For the significance of the gestures of tearing one’s hair and weeping, see 1.2.1. Although the boundary between grief and anger is fluid, the tendency for *zorn* to accompany revenge (*gerich*) is well attested (see 1.2.2 above).

<sup>20</sup> When he hears the knights approaching, Parzival exclaims ‘wan wolde et nû der tiuvel komen / mit grimme zorneclîche!’ (120,18f.). This is discussed below at 3.3.4.2.

complains that Parzival ‘unsich wendet gâher reise’ (121,6). The knights’ impatience with Parzival is stressed again, as Karnahkarnanz is detained by the boy’s questions about knighthood, arms and armour: ‘Die ritter zurnden daz er hielt / bî dem knappen der vil tumpheit wîelt’ (124,15f.). Parzival is portrayed as being so utterly ignorant as to be completely unresponsive to the mood of the knights. Karnahkarnanz, on the other hand, is a model of patience, dealing with each of Parzival’s questions in turn.<sup>21</sup>

Anger arising from impatience would certainly qualify as culpable anger according to Gregory the Great (see 1.7 above). The knights therefore inadvertently set Parzival a poor example. Their own haste to pursue Imane’s abductors (120,24; 121,5; 124,23; 125,9) is mirrored by Parzival’s haste to find Artus (128,15; 138,2; 143,20), pursue Schionatulander’s killer (141,29), and become a knight (149,12-16; 150,29). The image of Parzival ‘gagernde als ein trappe’ (149,26) only serves to underline his impatience, which continues to be in evidence throughout his subsequent encounter with Ither (see 3.2.1.3 below).

Parzival is evidently unaware of the value of patience as a virtue and of the need to control his anger. Although Herzeloide’s advice to her son does contain a reference to anger, this is to be found in the context of accepting instruction from an older man:

Op dich ein grâ wîse man  
zuht wil lêrn als er wol kan,  
dem soltu gerne volgen,  
und wis im niht erbolgen. (127,21-24)<sup>22</sup>

This compares with the advice that Perceval’s mother gives him in *Le Conte du Graal*:

Biax fix, as preudomes parlez  
Et lor compaignie tenez;  
Preudom ne forconseille mie  
Ciax qui tienent sa compaignie. (563-66)

Chrétien’s nobleman (*preudom*) has been transformed by Wolfram into a grey-haired wise man (*ein grâ wîse man*).<sup>23</sup> Furthermore, Parzival is given the additional tip that he should not bristle at an old man’s advice (*wis im niht erbolgen*). Although the idea that

<sup>21</sup> For the ‘Doctrine of Contraries’ and patience as the antidote to anger, see 1.3.2 above. The knights’ anger is without precedent in *Le Conte du Graal*.

<sup>22</sup> The past participle *erbolgen*, meaning ‘puffed up with anger’ (see 1.1.2 above) is found three times in *Parzival* (127,23f.; 157,5f.; 393,11f.), each time rhyming with *volgen* (Yeandle 1984: 239; Eichholz 1987: 228). It seems to me that these three references are not unconnected. The last two are discussed at 3.2.3 and 3.3.2 respectively.



old men provide good advice is enshrined in proverbial wisdom, as is the notion that youth has a natural antipathy towards correction (Yeandle 1984: 240), it appears to have gone unremarked that there is an interesting parallel to Herzeloide's advice in *Der deutsche Cato* (see 1.6.1 above):

Du solt bî manegem bilde nemen  
welch dinc dir sülle missezemen;  
dem vrumen soltu volgen,  
dem böesen wis erbolgen. (379-82)

Wolfram seems to combine proverbial wisdom about old age with the traditional idea that one should take one's example from the good and reserve one's anger for the bad. The emphasis on the connection between old age and wisdom creates a contrast between Gurnemanz and Parzival, focusing more sharply on Parzival's youth and inexperience. However, Herzeloide's suggestion that Parzival should not be angry with his advisor fails to indicate when anger *would* be appropriate. The idea of being angry with the bad, i.e. sin and/or sinners, as suggested in *Der deutsche Cato*, is in line with Gregory the Great's idea of justifiable anger (see 1.7 above), but is not clearly expressed in Herzeloide's advice. As will be seen, Parzival soon demonstrates just how little he understands about the control of anger.

### 3.2.1.2 Lähelin and Orilus

The brothers Lähelin and Orilus are both characterized by *zorn* and are recognizable by their dragon emblem, as is made clear when Orilus appears before his sister, Cunneware, at Artus's court:

bî den trachen ûfem kursît  
erkande sin wol, wan ein strît:  
si sprach 'du bist der bruoder mîn,  
Orilus, od Lähelîn. (275,21-24)<sup>24</sup>

Lähelin is without precedent in *Le Conte du Graal* and appears in the flesh only once in *Parzival*, at Kanvoleis (see 3.1.3 above). Gahmuret's success in the field provokes Lähelin's anger ('do begunde zürnen Lähelîn', 79,13), but their subsequent encounter leads to the 'smæhlîchen pîn' (79,26) of Lähelin's first defeat (85,28). Although he is never seen again, Lähelin's name is mentioned later in four different

---

<sup>23</sup> This is picked up in the episode where the hero puts this advice into practice. In *Le Conte du Graal*, Gornemant is first introduced as a *preudom* (1353) and subsequently referred to as such, with no reference to his age or appearance. In *Parzival*, the hero specifically refers to his mother's description as he greets Gurnemanz (162,29f.).

<sup>24</sup> See also Green 1978: 69-70. Hatto (1980a: 186) also agrees that, by implication, Lähelin's escutcheon must be the dragon.

contexts: he is responsible for overrunning two of Gahmuret's lands, Norgals and Waleis, and for the death of many of his people (128,4-10; 141,7; 331,15f.); he obtains the grail horse, Gringuljete, by *rêroup* (261,29; 339,26-340,6; 473,22-30; 540,28-541,2); he is the brother of Orilus and Cunneware (152,20; 275,24); finally, he is a formidable warrior (301,14-16; 445,21-26).

Lähelin's seizure of Gahmuret's lands may well represent his revenge for his earlier defeat, although this is never made explicit in the text.<sup>25</sup> A cycle of violence would thus appear to be carried forward, in which defeat and dishonour lead to revenge and bloodshed. Parzival's instinctive desire to avenge the loss of Norgals and Waleis (128,11f.) shows how this cycle would naturally tend to repeat itself. As the response to wounded honour, *zorn* is a driving force behind this pattern of behaviour, as will be seen.

Lähelin's past misdemeanours and his relationship to Cunneware and Orilus give rise to a certain irony, for Parzival unwittingly finds himself avenging a slight to the sister of the very man on whom he himself wants to be revenged. At the same time, Parzival's prowess, his own commission of *rêroup*, and his possession of a grail horse give him a certain similarity to Lähelin, such that Trevrizent initially mistakes Parzival for him (474,1).<sup>26</sup> Trevrizent characterizes Lähelin's misappropriation of the Grail horse as '*rêroup*' (473,30), and Parzival seems to acknowledge some similarity between them in his reply (475,4-12).

A further irony derives from the fact that Parzival's own act of *rêroup*, the removal of Ither's armour (475,5-12), is committed against a man whom Parzival himself compares to Lähelin (154,25). This cannot be a case of mistaken identity, since Artus has already told Parzival the red knight's name (150,9).<sup>27</sup> Although there is a superficial similarity between Ither and Lähelin, in so far as they may both be red knights and both

<sup>25</sup> Johnson (1968: 614) points out that it is tempting to derive the hostility between the families of Gahmuret and Lähelin from the latter's 'fiery temperament and his defeat by Gahmuret at Kanvoleis'.

<sup>26</sup> The full irony of the initial conversation between Trevrizent and Parzival is explored by Johnson (1972: 142f.). See also Green 1978: 67f. on correspondences between Parzival and Lähelin.

<sup>27</sup> See Yeandle (1984: 258-63) on 128,4 for the likelihood of a 'common ancestor' for Ither and Lähelin. Loomis (1949: 394-414) considers it possible that Lähelin was a Red Knight, since Trevrizent mistakes Parzival for him whilst Parzival is wearing red arms. Hatto (1980a: 343, fn. 13) points out that, whilst it would not be unusual for Orilus and Lähelin, as brothers, to use the same heraldic device (i.e. the dragon), one would expect them to use different colours, but that, if this had been the case, Cunneware would have had no difficulty distinguishing between the two. Green (1978b: 67) suggests that Ither's behaviour is inconsistent with that of a homicide, as typified by Lähelin, and interprets the reference as ironic, since it is Parzival who behaves like Lähelin at this point. Johnson (1972: 137f.) suggests that Parzival instinctively puts Ither into the same class as Lähelin. See also 3.2.3 below.

appear to be aggressors, afflicted by *zorn*, there are also important differences.

Whereas Lähelin is an outsider with no legitimate claim to Gahmuret's lands, Ither is 'Artûses basen sun' (145,11) and evidently feels that the law is on his side (146,21). It is perhaps a mark of Parzival's inexperience that he is unable to distinguish between justified and unjustified aggression, between *ira per zelum* and *ira per vitium*.<sup>28</sup>

Lähelin's brother, Orilus, plays a more prominent part in the action and is clearly based on the Haughty Knight of the Heath (L'Orgueilleux de la Lande) in *Le Conte du Graal*. However, unlike Orilus, the Haughty Knight is not related to the maiden who does not laugh and does not have a brother. Furthermore, the Haughty Knight is not associated with the dragon imagery or the anger that characterize Orilus.<sup>29</sup>

Orilus's anger is first mentioned in Jeschute's warning to Parzival as he prepares to leave her tent:

hebt iuch enwec: wan kumt mîn man,  
ir müezet zürnen lîden,  
daz ir gerner möhtet mîden. (132,12-14)

Parzival's total contempt for this warning betrays his immaturity: 'wê waz fürht ich iurs mannes zorn?' (132,16). He has no concept of the consequences of his actions and no appreciation of the fact that, ironically, Jeschute, rather than he, has more to fear, for Orilus's subsequent attitude to his wife is repeatedly characterized as *zorn* (259,26; 264,1; 265,21; 272,24).

At their second meeting, Jeschute explains to Parzival that her impoverished appearance is the result of her husband's anger — 'sus tuot er gein mir zürnen schîn' (259,26). It is then left to the narrator to recapitulate the reasons for Orilus's behaviour: 'Ich wil iu sagen des einen zorn' (264,1). It emerges from this that Orilus takes very seriously his responsibility as Jeschute's guardian. Fearing that she has been raped and dishonoured whilst under his protection, 'des lasters nam er pflihte' (264,11). He punishes her for her assumed complicity, which is his right, as the narrator is quick to point out (264,16-19). Thus, once again, a perceived loss of honour is the cause of *zorn*, which in turn leads to violence.

<sup>28</sup> For definitions of *ira per zelum* and *ira per vitium*, see 1.7.

<sup>29</sup> Although the Haughty Knight states 'molt me pot en irié veoir' (*Perceval* 3888), this is inconclusive — the line does not seem to be dealt with by Kleiber 1978, but the reference to 'ce poise moi' (*Perceval* 3880) might suggest *ire-douleur* (Kleiber 1978: 208-10). When the Haughty Knight and Perceval fight, the phrase 'Si s'entrevient par tel ire' (*Perceval* 3920) clearly reflects *ire-colère* (Kleiber 1978: 305) and would seem to represent *furor heroicus* (see 1.7.3 above), afflicting both parties in equal measure.

It is perhaps significant that in *Parzival*, unlike in *Le Conte du Graal*, Orilus's wife is the sister of Erec (134,6). Although it is impossible to know whether a comparison was intended by Wolfram, the narrator makes a suggestive comment:

ich enwil iu niht von zorne sagen,  
daz manger hât sîn wîp geslagen  
umb ir krenker schulde. (135,25-27)

Thus one's attention is drawn to the fact that, although he treats her shabbily, Orilus does not resort to physical violence against his wife. In this, his treatment of Jeschute resembles Erec's treatment of Enite after leaving Karnant, which is also characterized by *zorn* (see 2.1.2 above).

When Orilus and Parzival eventually meet, Orilus launches himself into the attack 'mit zornes site' (260,22) and grasps a lance from Gaheviez (260,28), linking him too to Ither.<sup>30</sup> However, the most remarkable thing about Orilus is his coat of arms. During the fight, Orilus and his dragon emblem seem to become almost synonymous:

ûf des schilde vander  
einen trachen als er lebte.  
ein ander trache strebte  
ûf sîne helme gebunden;  
an den selben stunden  
manec guldîn trache kleine  
(mit mangem edelen steine  
muosen die gehêret sîn:  
ir ougen wâren rubîn)  
ûf der decke und ame kursît. (262,4-13)

The fact that Parzival is fighting against more than just a man is explicitly confirmed:

prîs gedient hie Parzivâl,  
daz er sich alsus weren kan  
wol hundert trachn und eines man.  
ein trache wart versêret,  
sîne wunden gemêret,  
der ûf Orilus helme lac. (263,14-19)

Indeed, the dragon is so closely associated with its wearer that he is referred to as the one 'der truoc den serpent' (276,10) (Green 1978: 70).<sup>31</sup> The dragon also identifies Cunneware's tent:

als oben ein trache in sînen klân  
hets ganzen apfels halben teil.  
den trachen zugen vier wintseil,  
reht alser lebendec dâ flûge  
untz poulûn gein den lûften zûge.

<sup>30</sup> Green (1978b: 69) points out that this spear is described as 'gevârwet genuoc, / reht als er sîniu wâpen truoc' (260,29f.) and suggests that we are meant to gain the impression that Orilus too is a Red Knight. For a more detailed analysis of the inherent irony in the very full description of Orilus's arms, see Johnson 1972: 139-42.

<sup>31</sup> Green does not explore the significance of the dragon imagery.

dâ bî erkandez Orilus:  
wan sîniu wâpen wâren sus. (278,14-20)<sup>32</sup>

The use of dragon imagery is interesting, since in the Middle Ages, dragons were often used in heraldic contexts and were associated not only with courage and nobility, but also with the Devil and sin, including anger (see 1.2.5.1 above). Orilus's dragon emblem thus seems to match his fiery temperament.

Just as there are parallels between Lâhelin and Parzival, so there are also close parallels between Orilus and Parzival, for Parzival too is characterized by dragon imagery, particularly in Herzeloide's dream:

si dûhte wunderlîcher site,  
wie si wære eins wurmes amme,  
der sît zerfuorte ir wamme,  
und wie ein trache ir brüste süge,  
und daz der gâhes von ir flüge,  
sô daz sin nimmer mêr gesach. (104,10-15)

The fact that the dragon symbolizes Parzival is made explicit by Trevrizent when he later tells the hero 'du wær daz tier daz si dâ souc, / unt der trache der von ir dâ flouc' (476,27f.).<sup>33</sup> There is also a twist of irony when Orilus boasts of his ability to vanquish Jeschute's alleged lover 'ob sîn âtem gæbe fiur / als eines wilden trachen' (137,18f.).<sup>34</sup>

However, Parzival and Orilus are also alike in their thirst for revenge. When Herzeloide first tells Parzival of the wrongs he has suffered at the hands of Lâhelin, he reacts instinctively: 'diz rich ich, muoter, ruocht es got: / in verwundet noch mîn gabylôt' (128,11f.). Similarly, when Sigune repeats this information, adding further details about Orilus, Parzival replies 'swenne ich daz mac gerechen, / daz wil ich gerne zeichen' (141,27f.). Parzival's first instinct, when Keie beats Cunneware and Antanor, is to reach for his javelin (153,18), but he is prevented from launching it by the hustle and bustle around the Queen. He also reaches for his javelins as he asks Sigune to name the slayer of Schionatulander (139,9-11). The close identity between Parzival and Orilus is further underlined when Orilus surrenders to Cunneware:

<sup>32</sup> Hatto (1980: 198) believes that Cunneware's pennant recalls the dragon windsocks favoured by the emperors Constantius Augustus and Otto IV. However, the image of the tent being lifted into the air by a fabulous creature may recall the legendary flight of Alexander the Great (see Cary 1956: 134f.). Although the flight usually involved Alexander being transported in a chariot or cage, he was also associated with a magnificent tent (Cary 1956: 221 and 331f.). Hatto (1980: 190) comments 'the symbolism of Alexander's conception and birth is consonant with that of Herzeloide's dream and so will have helped to consolidate it in Wolfram's imagination, since he can scarcely have failed to know of it', which would support the notion that Wolfram was familiar with the Alexander legends. See also fn. 195 below.

<sup>33</sup> Dragon imagery also characterizes Rennewart and Cliboris in *Willehalm* (270,25-27; 409,18f.)

dîne slege tuont mir nimmer wol:  
 wirtz zît daz ich die rechen sol,  
 ich ginre den, swerz ruochet sehen,  
 daz mir grôz leit ist dran geschehen.  
 ouch hilft mirz klagen der kûenste man  
 den muoter ie zer werlt gewan:  
 der nennet sich der rîter rôt. (276,15-21)

It is clear that if Parzival had known Orilus's identity, and Cunneware's relationship to him, events could have turned out quite differently. However, it is also apparent that, in respect of Cunneware, Parzival has acted as Orilus himself would have wished to act.<sup>35</sup>

Just as Lâhelin is kept in the consciousness of the reader/listener through later references, Orilus is also kept in view. When Parzival faces Gawan at Plimizoel, we are reminded that his shield bears the damage inflicted by, amongst others, Orilus (300,3-5). At the end of Book VI, Orilus and Jeschute are amongst those who go their separate ways in the general dispersal of Artus's court. When Parzival reaches Trevrizent's hermitage at Fontan la salvatsche, this is identified as the place where Orilus received Parzival's oath (452,13f.) and 'dâ Orilus zorn verdarp' (455,30). It is thus a place associated with the assuaging of *zorn*, which is highly appropriate in view of subsequent developments in Book IX (see below). Like his brother, Orilus infiltrates the Gawan episodes chiefly by association with Gawan's horse, Gringuljete (339,27; 540,30; 545,28f.).<sup>36</sup>

Neither Lâhelin nor Orilus is portrayed in a universally bad light. Whilst Lâhelin does not appear to have much to commend him and remains outside the influence of Artus's court, he is not deaf to female entreaties and spares the life of Gawan (301,13-20). Meanwhile, Orilus spares Erec (134,14-19), presumably also Pliopliheri (134,27-135,2), and is actually reintegrated into Arthurian society, thus posing no further threat of violence.<sup>37</sup> Lâhelin's motive for overrunning Waleis and Norgals may well relate to his earlier defeat by Gahmuret, and there is insufficient information about his encounter

---

<sup>34</sup> Hatto (1980: 187) considers Orilus to be an 'overdone, inflated dragon' who is due to be deflated by the 'true dragon' here indicated (i.e. Parzival).

<sup>35</sup> Green (1978: 68f.) notes the following additional parallels between Orilus and Parzival: (i) Trebuchet has forged Orilus's helmet (261,1) and Parzival's Grail sword (253,28f.); (ii) Orilus carries a spear from Gahevies (260,28), whilst Parzival carries a sword from Gahevies (246,4) in addition to the Grail sword; (iii) Orilus rides a Grail horse (Gringuljete), as Parzival later will. See also Johnson 1972: 139-42, for the full irony of Parzival's encounter with Orilus.

<sup>36</sup> However, it is also interesting that Malcreatiure's horse recalls Jeschute's (520,10-14), since Gawan will soon find himself riding this sickly specimen.

<sup>37</sup> Hatto (trans.) 1980: 445 lists Plihopliheri as 'a knight slain by Orilus', but Wolfram does not state that he is killed. Green (1978: 50) notes this point and the fact that Orilus and Lâhelin may have some redeeming features. However, Green's argument is essentially that the brothers' actions are presented in such a way as to invite criticism.

with Turkentals or Parzival's subjects to form an opinion about the rights and wrongs of the situation. As for his encounter with Lybbeals, a comparison with Parzival's encounter with the unnamed *templeis* seems logical, not least because Lähelin's name is evoked at this point (445,21), possibly a direct allusion to his fight with Lybbeals. Since the Grail Knights take no prisoners — 'si nement niemens sicherheit, / si wâgnt ir lebn gein jenes lebn' (492,8f.) — and Parzival's opponent threatens him explicitly with death, Lähelin presumably found himself in a similar situation.

Orilus's actions towards Jeschute also receive some justification from the narrator:

er möht ir sîne hulde  
versagen, swenner wolde:  
nieman daz wenden solde,  
ob [der] man des wîbes hât gewalt. (264,16-19)

Again, in relation to the killing of Galoes and Schionatulander, there is insufficient information upon which to base a judgement of Orilus's actions. However, it is noticeable that repeated allusions to the death of Galoes mention Orilus only once (141,8f.) and concentrate instead on the role of Annore and *minne* in sending him to his death (80,14-18; 91,16-92,8; 586,19-21). Similarly, Sigune blames herself for the death of Schionatulander (141,16-24; 440,2-8), though she twice names Orilus as his killer (141,8f.; 439,30).

Lähelin and Orilus therefore seem to symbolize a certain mode of knightly behaviour, in which violent action is prompted by violent emotion, often with deadly results. Parallels between the brothers and the young Parzival show how the hero could easily fall into a similar pattern of behaviour and point to the importance of controlling *zorn*.

### 3.2.1.3 Ither

The figure of Ither von Gaheviez, King of Kukumerlant in *Parzival*, corresponds to that of the Red Knight in Chrétien's *Le Conte du Graal*. In both texts, anger plays a part in the hero's encounter with the knight bearing red arms. Chrétien presents the Red Knight as a usurper, bent on achieving gain by violent means. He is never named and, unlike Ither, is unrelated to Arthur or Perceval. His death is unlamented and, although Perceval adopts his red armour and arms, this is not stressed by Chrétien in the same way as it is by Wolfram. In *Parzival*, by contrast, not only is Ither a close relative of Artus (145,11) who considers that he has a legitimate claim to Artus's land (145,13f.; 146,21-30;

154,21), but he is also loudly lamented by the court and especially by Ginover after his death (159,23-25; 160,1-30).

Ither's anger is aroused when Parzival returns from Artus's court and demands his arms and armour, grabbing the reins of his horse and perhaps impugning his good name with the words 'du maht wol wesen Lâhelîn' (154,25). Although he strikes Parzival with the butt end of his lance, thereby avoiding the likelihood of fatal injury, Ither's blow is nevertheless hefty enough to draw blood and we are told 'der helt was zornes dræte' (155,1). In *Le Conte du Graal*, by contrast, Perceval does not grab the reins of the Red Knight's horse, nor is there anything comparable to Parzival's allusion to Lâhelin — it seems that the Red Knight simply wearies of Perceval's repeated demands for his armour, and anger is indicated as the narrator tells us 'Lors fu li chevaliers iriez' (1102) (Kleiber 1978: 315). The Red Knight also strikes Perceval with the butt end of his lance, but in this case it simply causes Perceval to fall forward onto the neck of his horse (1103-08).

Parzival's actions constitute a clear slight to Ither's honour. To begin with, Parzival must know that he is not dealing with Lâhelin here, in view of Artus's earlier statement 'ez ist Ithêr von Gaheviez' (150,9). Although the narrator passes no comment, it is possible that association with the infamous Lâhelin seems insulting to Ither. More importantly, the gesture of seizing the horse's reins could be construed as an attempt to force Ither's surrender (Bumke 1986: 354; Peil 1975: 55f.).<sup>38</sup> In view of Ither's position as 'der ob der tavelrunder / den hœhsten prîs solde tragen' (160,6f.) and Parzival's obvious youth and inexperience, this must appear insulting to Ither. The severity of the insult is reflected in the force of the blow struck by him. Thus *zorn* is once again seen to be aroused by a perceived slight to chivalric honour.

Parzival's anger is in turn aroused by the blow that he receives and it causes him to reach spontaneously for his javelin:

Parzivâl der knappe guot  
stuont al zornic ûf dem plân.  
sîn gabylôt begreif er sân. (155,4-6)

However, the ground is laid for this display of temper when Parzival asks Artus for Ither's armour. The boy's innocent wonderment at the arms and armour of

---

<sup>38</sup> Compare the attempt by Keie to seize the reins of Erec's horse in Hartmann's *Erec* (4629<sup>40</sup>-4629<sup>43</sup>). Erec eventually also strikes Keie with the blunt end of his lance, but in this case the rules of the game are clearly understood by both participants. Like Ither, Erec is angry, but he is vindicated, therefore his anger is at least tacitly approved (see 2.1.5.4 above).



Karnahkarnanz is here replaced by covetousness, and curiosity gives way to impatience as Parzival stands in front of Artus ‘gagernde als ein trappe’ (149,26).<sup>39</sup> He does not ask for Ither’s arms and armour — ‘in wil hie nihtes biten’ (149,27), he demands them as of right. This sense of impatience is underlined after Ither’s death by Parzival’s unseemly haste to remove the dead man’s armour: the word *dicke* is used twice within ten lines (155,19-28). Furthermore, the fact that Ither is left lying where he fell betrays both callousness and haste.<sup>40</sup> If indeed it was construed as an insult, Parzival’s allusion to Lähelin could also be interpreted as a symptom of anger.<sup>41</sup>

The situation is broadly similar in *Le Conte du Graal*, where Perceval’s anger is also aroused by the blow that he has been struck:

Et li vallés s’est correchiez  
Quant il senti qu’il fu blechiez  
De la colee qu’il ot prise. (1109-11)<sup>42</sup>

However, whilst Perceval seems to be in a hurry to obtain the Red Knight’s arms and armour (and subsequently to strip the dead body), the striking comparison to a bustard is absent and there is no mention of what happens to the Red Knight’s corpse.

Ither is kept in the mind’s eye by virtue of his arms, which Parzival assumes on his death and wears throughout the work. Parzival, like Ither, becomes known as ‘the red knight’. This emphasis on the colour red has prompted much scholarly interest, especially since Ither’s appearance is so conspicuously red (145,17-146,3). The inspiration for this description is generally thought to be Mabonagrín, the last and most formidable of the hero’s adversaries in Chrétien’s *Erec et Enide* and Hartmann’s *Erec*.<sup>43</sup> However, red knights are ubiquitous in Old French and Middle High German romance, and there is little evidence to suggest that the colour red is being used by Wolfram or Hartmann to reflect an angry disposition (see 1.2.4.1 above).

Ither is an ambivalent figure (Delabar 1990: 75-132). For all his excellent qualities, he poses a serious threat to Artus and thus to social order. Perhaps this is why Wolfram

<sup>39</sup> The significance of the bustard image is unclear (Nellmann 1994, II: 537).

<sup>40</sup> For the connection between impatience and anger, see the description of Prudentius’s *Ira* at 1.3.3. See also 1.7 for Gregory the Great’s idea that culpable anger springs from impatience and 3.2.1 above for more on Parzival’s impatience.

<sup>41</sup> The effect of anger on the tongue is mentioned by Freidank: ‘In zorne sprichet lîhte ein man / daz wirste, daz er danne kan’ (*Bescheidenheit* 65,2f.) (see 1.6.3 above).

<sup>42</sup> Kleiber 1978 does not appear to deal with these lines. However, Busby (1993: 439) comments with regard to MS variation for l. 1109: ‘s’est correchiez traduit mieux que fu correchiez la colère soudaine de Perceval quand il se rend compte qu’il a été blessé.’

gives him red hair, which often has negative associations, including a disposition to anger (see 1.2.4.1.1). Parzival's association of Ither with Lähelin (154,25f.) also suggests negative connotations.<sup>44</sup>

The connection between anger and bloodshed is nowhere more immediately apparent than in Ither's death, which is a direct consequence of there being no one and nothing to restrain Parzival, who does not know better at this stage. A stark contrast is provided by the behaviour of Iwanet, who refuses to hand Parzival his javelins because these do not become a knight (157,19f.), thus preventing an exact recurrence of events in future.<sup>45</sup> Furthermore, although Iwanet finds it rather strange when Parzival insists on wearing the clothes that his mother provided under Ither's armour (156,30-157,2), 'iedoch muos er im volgen, / ern was im niht erbolgen' (157,5f.). Martin (1976: 158) regarded 157,6 as 'Flickvers, durch den Reim veranlaßt'. However, these lines gain from consideration in the light of the idea that 'dem vrumen soltu volgen, / dem bösen wis erbolgen' (*Cato* 379-82) (see 1.6.1 and 3.2.1.1 above). On the one hand, Iwanet is in no position to argue with an undisciplined youth who has just killed the flower of Arthurian knighthood. On the other hand, despite the comical nature of the situation, his accession to Parzival's wish can be seen as tacit acknowledgement of the latter's innate qualities.

In Parzival's encounter with Ither, *zorn* is seen to be both morally and physically dangerous. Ither's *zorn* costs him his life, whilst Parzival's *zorn* causes him to say and do things that he will later regret, as the narrator comments: 'sît dô er sich paz versan, / ungerne het erz dô getân' (161,7f.).<sup>46</sup> There is no suggestion that Perceval regrets killing the Red Knight, nor are we given any reason to believe that he should do so. In *Parzival*, however, there seems to be an implicit suggestion that one should be slow to anger (see 1.5.1 and 1.6.2 above). As will be seen, reflection is an important counter to

---

<sup>43</sup> Nellmann (1994, II: 535f.) on 145,16 draws attention to the parallel in Ulrich von Zatzikhoven's *Lanzelet* (3270-73). Hartmann's description (*Erec* 9015-19) expands considerably on Chrétien's statement that Mabonagrain is a knight 'armé d'unes armes vermeilles' (*EE*. 5891).

<sup>44</sup> As there is no comparable character in *Le Conte du Graal*, the reference to Lähelin adds an extra dimension to Parzival's encounter with Ither (see 3.2.1.2 above). It should also be noted that Ither's stance before Nantes is reminiscent of the apocalyptic Whore of Babylon (Revelation 17.3f.), the significance of which cannot be explored further here.

<sup>45</sup> However, Parzival's instincts remain unchanged, even after his visit to Gurnemanz, as becomes clear when Parzival meets the *redespæher man* (see 3.2.2 below). Note that, like Parzival, Iwanet is a 'knappe valsches vrîe' (147,17).

<sup>46</sup> See Thomasin's comments (see 1.6.2 above): 'swer volget dem zorn, spricht unde tuot / daz in dar nâch niht dunket guot. / dâ von sol man sich wol bewarn / daz man sînn zorn niht lâz volvarn' (*DWG* 673-76).

anger and is something that is particularly associated with Gawan (see 3.3 below), but later also comes to be associated with Parzival himself.

#### 3.2.1.4 Keie

As the seneschal of Artus's court, Keie is an indispensable figure in medieval German Arthurian romance, although hardly one of its leading lights (Haupt 1971: 9-12). His character is comprised of contradictory elements: he is, on the one hand, noble and brave, on the other hand, he has a malicious tongue. There is a certain amount of humour attached to his portrayal, yet he fulfils an important role in Artus's household and often acts as a catalyst, inspiring the hero to deeds of prowess (Haupt 1971: 9-12 and 121-36).

The contradictions inherent in Keie may well arise from the imperfect amalgamation of two different characters. There seems to have been an early Welsh tradition of Cei as a warrior hero: tall, fair, and close to Arthur (Gowans 1988: 4-36). Whilst Geoffrey of Monmouth and Wace describe Kay as Arthur's seneschal, Kay is still seen as a war leader and companion of Arthur (Gowans 1988: 37-45). It is only with Chrétien de Troyes that elements of a second character can be observed, that of the truculent steward (Haupt 1971: 60-72; Woledge 1969).<sup>47</sup>

Keie's anger is first seen when he seizes Cunneware by the hair after she has laughed at Parzival (151,21-26). This is a gesture which is consistent with execution.<sup>48</sup> However, the seneschal does not kill her, but beats her instead with his staff of office, allowing the narrator to make a pun: 'ir rüke wart kein eit gestabt: / doch wart ein stap sô dran gehabt' (151,27f.).<sup>49</sup> The seneschal uses his staff of office to show people their places: now he shows Cunneware her place, correcting her as if she had broken an oath. Since Parzival seems to be such unpromising material, Keie defends the honour of the court, outraged that Cunneware has slighted so many much more worthy contenders by failing to laugh up to this point (152,7-12). He sees his own role as corrective,

---

<sup>47</sup> I have coined the phrase 'truculent steward'.

<sup>48</sup> Compare the incident in *Willehalm*, when the hero, consumed by rage, grabs his sister by the hair: 'dô begreif der zornebaere gast / bî den zöpfen die künegîn: / er wolt ir mit dem swerte sîn / daz houbt hân ab geswungen' (147,18-21). Eichholz (1987: 171) on *Pz.* 151,24f. notes the parallel, but not its implications.

describing himself as a ‘vāngec netze’ (152,4) for vanished honour and later excusing his actions, saying ‘ich tetz durch hoflîchen site / und wolt iuch hân gebezzert mite’ (218,25f.).

By introducing a corrective purpose for Keie’s anger, Wolfram suggests a possible justification for his actions.<sup>50</sup> The use of anger to correct one’s own sins or the sins of others was one of the few legitimate uses of anger identified by Gregory the Great (see 1.7 above). The notion that one should be angry with miscreants also found its way into didactic literature (see 1.6.1, 3.2.1.1 and 3.2.1.3 above). However, in this case, Keie is ‘der unwîse’ (152,1), mistaking a youth in fool’s clothing for a fool, and the spectacle of him beating a courtly lady is an ugly one.<sup>51</sup> Wolfram evidently feels this acutely, for the narrator immediately states:

in zorne wunders vil geschiht.  
sîns slages wær im erteilet niht  
vorem rîche ûf dise magt,  
diu vil von friwenden wart geklagt.  
op si halt schilt solde tragn,  
diu unfuoge ist dâ geslagn:  
wan si was von arde ein fûrstîn.  
Orilus und Lâhelîn  
ir bruoder, hetenz die gesehen,  
der slege minre wære geschehen. (152,13-22)<sup>52</sup>

This is quite an important passage for an understanding of Wolfram’s concept of the threat posed by *zorn*, pointing to the reactions and consequences which it might unleash. First, the man who acts in anger leaves himself exposed in law: ‘His right to strike this maiden [. . .] would not have been upheld before the Emperor’ (Hatto (trans.) 1980: 87).<sup>53</sup> Secondly, his action provokes distress amongst friends and onlookers — it

---

<sup>49</sup> For details of the seneschal’s staff see Bumke (1986: 249f.). Nellmann (1994, II: 539) and Eichholz (1987: 173) on 151,27 and 28 both draw attention to the practice of swearing oaths on the judge’s staff. Nellmann suggests ‘Keie wird scherzhaft mit dem Richter verglichen’ but neither explores the pun in detail. The question of Keie’s status in Artus’s court may be relevant here (see fn. 61 below). If Wolfram did think of him as a *ministerialis*, it should perhaps be borne in mind that *ministeriales* were frequently entrusted with legal business (Arnold 1985: 192-98).

<sup>50</sup> Wolfram later insists that a corrective figure such as Keie performs a necessary function. See particularly 296,13-297,29, where Wolfram transposes the need for such a figure into a contemporary setting (the court of Hermann of Thuringia).

<sup>51</sup> It seems that Keie breaks his staff whilst beating Cunneware (Eichholz 1987: 173f., on 151,29). This may symbolize his transgression (it could also symbolize a breakdown in justice — see fn. 49 above). Chrétien’s Keu also has ‘un bastonet’ (*Perceval* 2795), but he does not use it to beat the maiden and it does not, therefore, assume the same significance. Note also that Keie’s actions also attract the disapproval of the court, as is made explicit later on: ‘dô sprâchens alle gelîche, / beide arm unde rîche, / daz Keie hete missetân’ (222,7-9).

<sup>52</sup> Kingrun later refers back to this episode, when he laments Clamide’s defeat and queries whether Artus should profit from the fact ‘daz Kai durch zorn hât geslagn / ein edele fûrstinne’ (221,20f.).

<sup>53</sup> This statement also clearly reflects badly on Artus (Nellmann 1994, II: 539 on 152,15).

therefore militates against joy.<sup>54</sup> Thirdly, such behaviour constitutes ‘unfuoge’, an offence against rank that would be incorrect even if the victim were a man.<sup>55</sup> This is particularly significant in view of the imminent encounter between Ither and Parzival, where each will act in anger and each will interpret the other’s action as an offence against his kingly rank.<sup>56</sup> Finally, the narrator touches on the most dangerous aspect of all: revenge. The presence of Cunneware’s brothers would have deterred Keie from such extreme action because they would have avenged it.<sup>57</sup> The audience/reader is already aware of the brothers’ violent tendencies and a note of irony is struck, as has already been seen, in so far as Parzival steps into the role of avenger in place of the very men he has sworn to take revenge on. Unlike Chrétien, Wolfram describes Parzival’s reaction to Keie’s actions: ‘im was von herzen leit ir nôt: / vil dicker greif zem gabilôt’ (153,17f.). This is precisely the spontaneous impulse to take revenge which leads to the killing of Ither, and only the great press around the queen prevents Parzival from killing Keie.<sup>58</sup>

It is notable that, in *Le Conte du Graal*, there is no suggestion of any corrective purpose behind Keu’s anger. When Perceval demands the Red Knight’s arms, we are told ‘Li seneschax, qui fu bleciez, / De che qu’il ot s’est correciez’ (1001f.), but this may indicate distress, in keeping with the general black mood of the court, rather than anger.<sup>59</sup> When Perceval greets the maiden, who now laughs for the first time in more than ten years and predicts his prowess, Keu, ‘cui la parole anuia molt’ (1049), jumps up and strikes the maiden in the face so hard that she falls to the floor. He also angrily kicks the Fool (Kleiber 1978: 272 and 375) — ‘Si le bouta el fu ardant / del pié par

<sup>54</sup> The notion that anger brings nothing but harm also passed into proverbial wisdom, compare *Iwein* 2026-29 (see 2.2.1 above).

<sup>55</sup> There is a persistent connection between *zorn* and *unfuoge* in *Parzival* (Zimmermann 1974: 66). This would seem to be another manifestation of the incompatibility of *zorn* with *zuht*; see Thomasin’s comments (at 1.6.2 above): ‘Swet volget dem nide oder dem zorn, / der hât sîn zuht gar verlorn’ (DWG 671f.).

<sup>56</sup> Parzival certainly is aware of his rank, as when he refuses to wait to be knighted and boasts of his mother: ‘ich wæn doch diust ein künegîn’ (150,2). Ither is, of course, offended not only by Parzival’s approach, but also by the attitude of Artus.

<sup>57</sup> Keie repeats his violent reaction when Antanor speaks out (152,23-153,13), but this does not attract any further narratorial comment, perhaps because Antanor does not seem to enjoy any particular social status.

<sup>58</sup> It also foreshadows Parzival’s failure at the Grail Castle, when he reacts in exactly the same way to the *redespæher man*: the only difference is that he reaches for his sword instead, having moved on from the use of javelins — a sure sign that inner, rather than outer, change is required.

corroz et par ire' (1056f.) — for no reason other than the Fool's earlier predictions that the maiden would identify the finest knight by her laughter. When news of the Red Knight's death at Perceval's hands then reaches the court and the Fool predicts that Keu will suffer for his actions, Keu is once again provoked to anger:

Cele parole tant greva  
Keu que par poi qu'il ne creva  
De mautalent et de corroz,  
Que il ne l'ala devant toz  
Tel contraer que mort l'eüst. (1275-79)<sup>60</sup>

Keu is thus portrayed as prone to very violent action, even to the point of contemplating killing. Indeed, we are told that he only abandons this idea because it would displease the king (1280f.). He is therefore presented here as a rather distasteful, irascible character, without any redeeming features.

The second reference to Keie's anger occurs after he has been defeated by Parzival at the Plimizoel. At this point, Wolfram launches into a long defence of Keie (296,13-297,29), the essence of which is that Keie is noble, courageous and loyal, fulfilling an essential role at court as the guardian of courtly propriety. However, his role makes enemies of those whose failings he exposes. This defence seems initially to be vindicated by the general consternation at Keie's misfortune (298,4f.) and by the reaction of Gawan (298,6-11). However, it soon emerges that the defence is strategically placed, for Keie is about to disgrace himself again: the man who was 'der ellens rîche' (293,19) in the field is now 'der zornes rîche' (298,12) on his sick bed.

Keie's *zorn* seems to derive from the fear that his injuries will not be avenged by Gawan. He has always served Artus and Gawan faithfully and has never been afraid to fight for Gawan, but he anticipates that Gawan will not do the same for him, commenting 'ir sît mir rîch ze wol geborn' (298,25). Keie is evidently a man with a

---

<sup>59</sup> Kleiber 1978 does not discuss these lines. The *carbonier* who directs Perceval to Arthur warns him that the king is 'lié et dolant' (845), 'liez' because Rion has been defeated (850-53) and 'iriez' because all his companions have returned to their castles (854-58), a clear case of *ire-douleur* (Kleiber 1978: 131, 135, 141, and 143). The prevailing mood is thus one of sorrow.

<sup>60</sup> *ire-colère* (Kleiber 1978: 355, 365, 374 and 377).

chip on his shoulder, perhaps deriving from inferior social status.<sup>61</sup> Although Gawan protests ‘du zürnest mit mir âne nôt’ (299,25), Keie’s fears are well-founded, for Gawan has no intention of dealing with Parzival by force of arms and rides out ‘sunder swert und âne sporn’ (299,29). That this continues to rankle with Keie emerges much later, when Gawan’s messenger arrives at Artus’s court. Whilst Ginover and Artus feel a mixture of sorrow and joy at the news from Gawan (645,7; 649,8f.), Keie mocks the mystery surrounding Gawan’s precise whereabouts ‘in sîme zorn’ (651,7). Finally, when Gawan receives Artus in great style, Keie is still suffering from sour grapes. As Keie mocks Gawan’s evident good fortune ‘in sîme schimpf’ (675,15), the narrator explains the reason for his behaviour:

dô dâhter noch des dinges,  
wand in Gâwân dort nich rach,  
dâ im sîn zeswer arm zebrach. (675,10-12)

In *Le Conte du Graal*, Keu’s defeat by Perceval is lamented by the court (4326f.) and especially by the king (4330-48). However, when, unlike in *Parzival*, Gauvain expressly offers to bring Perceval to the king, Keu becomes angry (Kleiber 1978: 385) — ‘A cest mot Kex se correcha’ (4370). There is no suggestion that Keu expects to be avenged and no allusion to any disparity in rank between him and Gauvain. When Gauvain remarks on this anger (Kleiber 1978: 361) — ‘Quidiez vos or vengier vostre ire / Et vostre mautalent a moi?’ (4406f.), the implication seems to be that Keu is simply angry at being defeated. Keu’s subsequent sarcastic comments about Gauvain’s success (4517-33) mark his final appearance in the unfinished *Conte du Graal*. It is therefore impossible to judge whether he continues to harbour any ill-feeling towards Gauvain.

Keie’s *zorn* towards Cunneware illustrates the corrective potential of anger, but this is overshadowed by the dramatic consequences that accompany its incorrect application. Keie’s *zorn* towards Gawan, on the other hand, reveals him to be a man of choleric temperament: the sort to nurse a grievance over a long period of time. This not only flies in the face of biblical and proverbial wisdom, but also makes him the worst sort of

<sup>61</sup> It is noticeable that all the prominent knights at Artus’s court are given a noble pedigree, with the exception of the seneschal, who is always just plain Keie. Bumke (1992: 438, fn. 86) suggests: ‘Der Grund für die negative Beleuchtung der Hofbeamten ist wohl darin zu sehen, daß die Inhaber der Hofämter als Ministerialen gedacht sind. Offenbar suchten die höfischen Dichter ihren fürstlichen Auftraggebern dadurch zu gefallen, daß sie die Ministerialen in ein schlechtes Licht setzten.’ This attractive idea would need to be reformulated to take account of the positive aspects highlighted by Wolfram. Several explanations are possible. Classen (1988: 399-402) concentrates on the idea that Wolfram’s evident respect for the office of seneschal reflects the rise in power of such court officials under the Staufer.

angry man from Gregory the Great's point of view.<sup>62</sup> It is also just possible that Keie's unseemly anger marks him as a man who has risen from the lower social orders.<sup>63</sup> Finally, the connection between anger and a desire for revenge can be seen only too clearly in Keie's case (see 1.2 above, especially 1.2.2).

The contradictory nature of Keie is exposed by both Wolfram and Chrétien. However, whilst the French author concentrates on the contradictions within the character of Keu, Wolfram widens the perspective to emphasize the contradiction between Keie's behaviour in certain circumstances and his office. By changing the mood of the court when Parzival arrives, Wolfram throws the spotlight on Keie's *zorn*. His small excursus on the consequences of anger (152,13-22) serves to emphasize that anger lies at the root of Keie's problems: if he did not lose his temper, he would be irreproachable.

### 3.2.1.5 Belrepeire

In *Parzival*, anger at Belrepeire is associated entirely with the besieging army. Thus, Parzival is informed on arrival that the occupants already have enough trouble with the 'zornec ellenthaftez her' (182,24) outside. Later, when Kingrun offers Parzival his surrender, Parzival's second suggestion is that he should surrender to Condwiramurs 'der dîn hêrre hôhen pîn / hât gefrumt mit zorne' (198,16f.). In both instances, *zorn* seems to express the aggression of the attackers, who have almost brought the inhabitants of Belrepeire to their knees. The presence of the army derives from Condwiramurs's rejection of Clamide, which he undoubtedly takes as a slight on his honour. The army's *zorn* is therefore the physical expression of Clamide's own *zorn* and Wolfram focuses sharply on the suffering and loss unleashed by it.

In *Le Conte du Graal*, the situation is slightly different. There is no suggestion that a marriage proposal has been rebuffed.<sup>64</sup> Instead, Clamadeu is presented simply as an aggressor and Aguingeron as his cruel henchman (1999-2037). When Perceval and

---

<sup>62</sup> See 1.5.1: 'sit [...] tardus ad iram' (James 1.19) and 'irascimini et nolite peccare sol non occidat super iracundiam vestram' (Ephesians 4.26). See also 1.6.1, *Disticha Catonis* II,15, preserved in German as 'Gedenke niht deheine vrist / des zornes des vergezzen ist' (*Cato* 265f.). Gregory describes four sorts of angry man: the first is quick to anger and quick to forget, the second is slow to anger and slow to forget, the third is quick to anger and slow to forget, and the fourth is slow to anger and quick to forget. Keie clearly falls into the third category, which is described as the worst: 'Alii autem quod est nequius et citius iracundiae flammis accipiunt, et tardius deponunt. [...] in malo secundum tertius superat' (*Moralia in Iob*, V,80).

<sup>63</sup> For righteous anger as the prerogative of the nobility, see 1.7. If my interpretation is correct, it would seem that Wolfram saw it as the prerogative strictly of the hereditary nobility.



Aguingeron meet, they are both seized by *furor heroicus* (see 1.7.3 above) ‘A l’ire et al corrous qu’il orent’ (2216)<sup>65</sup> whilst Perceval and Clamadeu ‘s’entrehaioient de mort’ (2670).<sup>66</sup>

### 3.2.2 Parzival’s First Visit to the Grail Castle

*Zorn* rises to the surface on two occasions during Parzival’s first visit to the Grail Castle, and both instances are without precedent in *Le Conte du Graal*. The first occasion is when Parzival is greeted by the *redespæher man*:

ze hove ein redespæher man  
bat komn ze vrävellîche  
den gast ellens rîche  
zem wîrte, als ob im wære zorn. (229,4-7)

This apparent display of *zorn* prompts Parzival to reach for his sword, but it has already been taken from him, thus preventing him from striking a fatal blow. As a result, Parzival draws blood as he clenches his fist in anger (see 1.2.1 above) and stains his sleeve with blood (229,8-14).<sup>67</sup> Evidently sensing Parzival’s anger, the assembled knights implore him ‘tuot iwer zuht gein im schîn’ (229,18) and ‘schütet ab iu zornes last’ (229,22). Their defence of the *redespæher man* is ‘ez ist ein man der schimpfes kraft / hât, swie trûrc wir anders sîn’ (229,16f.).<sup>68</sup> They thus attempt to draw Parzival’s attention not only to the incompatibility of *zuht* and *zorn*, but also to the importance of setting aside anger before entering the presence of Anfortas and achieving his destiny as the next Grail King.<sup>69</sup>

The *redespæher man* has no parallel in *Le Conte du Graal* and his appearance has been felt by some to be out of keeping with the rest of the Grail Castle episode (Weigand 1969: 75; Steppich 1993: 388). Nevertheless, as has been noted elsewhere

<sup>64</sup> Compare 184,21: the occupants of Belrepeire ‘arnden Clâmidês bete’.

<sup>65</sup> *ire-colère* (Kleiber 1978: 289, 295 and 299).

<sup>66</sup> Busby (1993: 113) records the variants ‘sentreairent’ and ‘sentrehairent’ for *Perceval* 2670. The implication is that a state of mortal enmity exists between Perceval and Clamadeu. However, there seems to be an element of *furor heroicus* here too.

<sup>67</sup> The bloodstained sleeve creates a parallel between Parzival and the boy carrying the bleeding lance (231,17-22) (Maczewski 1984: 16). It also creates a parallel with Gawan (521,13f.).

<sup>68</sup> We are told later of the Grail company that ‘sine kêrten sich an schimphen niht’ (242,7), which seems to have two meanings: on the one hand, they do not indulge in merriment, as evidenced by the great sorrow everywhere; on the other hand, they do not indulge in normal courtly pursuits — that is to say, they do not joust for pleasure but fight all knightly encounters to the death. The Grail Castle courtyard is described: ‘durch schimpf er niht zetretet was’ (227,9) — the grass is short and green because ‘dâ was bûhurdieren vermiten’ (227,11). Trevrizent later explains that the Grail knights take no prisoners: ‘si nement niemens sicherheit, / si wâgnt ir leb’n gein jenes leb’n’ (492,8f.). For a more detailed analysis of the ambiguity of *schimpf* in this context, see Maczewski 1984: 10f.

(Nellmann 1994, II: 569f. on 229,1-22 and 229,8f.), there are undoubtedly parallels between this strange character and Keie. Indeed, a comparison between Parzival's arrival at Artus's court and his arrival at the Grail Castle is illuminating.

When Parzival first arrives at Artus's court, sorrow is the prevailing emotion, just as it is at the Grail Castle.<sup>70</sup> Keie stands out from the rest of the court as the only person apart from Artus to speak out initially (150,11-22) and as the one who beats Cunneware and Antanor. Keie's very real *zorn* (152,13) contrasts with the *redespæher man*'s apparently deliberate *zorn* (229,7). However, Parzival's response to this *zorn*, real or otherwise, is exactly the same. Just as his first reaction to the beating of Cunneware and Antanor is to reach for his javelin (153,18), so his first reaction to the *redespæher man* is to reach for his sword (229,10f.). At Artus's court, he is prevented from launching the javelin by the press around the queen (153,19f.), whereas at the Grail Castle, the prior removal of his sword and the intervention of the knights prevent any violent action. The re-enactment of the impulse that led to the killing of Ither prefigures the re-insertion of the lance into Anfortas's wound (492,30), i.e. the re-enactment of the moment of Anfortas's injury. Two fateful moments are thus linked. In order for either Parzival or Anfortas to advance, this cycle of repetition must be broken. For Parzival, this means the abandonment of *zorn* and automatic *râche*.<sup>71</sup>

That Parzival has not shaken off his 'zornes last' (229,22) is demonstrated graphically by the second instance of *zorn* at the Grail Castle, as Parzival prepares to leave. After a restless night, in which he dreams of action on the battlefield (245,9-16), Parzival finds himself apparently alone in the Grail Castle. He arms himself, then runs through the chambers shouting for attention, but to no avail: 'ungefüege leit im dran geschach. / daz het im zorn gereizet' (247,6f.). Shouting at the top of his voice, he leaps onto his horse 'mit pâgenden Worten' (247,15).<sup>72</sup> Parzival's feverish agitation at this point betrays his anger (see 1.2.1 above) and shows him to be as easily roused to anger at the end of his visit as he was at the beginning.

---

<sup>69</sup> For the incompatibility of *zuht* and *zorn*, see Thomasin's comments (1.6.2 above): 'Swer volget dem nide oder dem zorn, / der hât sîn zuht gar verlorn' (DWG 671f.).

<sup>70</sup> Artus himself explains that the challenger in the red armour is Ither, 'der trûren mir durch freude stiez' (150,10).

<sup>71</sup> The importance of the encounter with the *redespæher man* and of Parzival's angry state is also noted by Duckworth (1980: 162-72).

<sup>72</sup> For shouting and cursing as symptoms of anger, see 1.2.1 and 1.2.2 above.

### 3.2.3 Parzival's Fall from Grace

#### 3.2.3.1 Sigune's Reproach

The first two individuals outside the Grail Castle to react to Parzival's failure to ask the question are Sigune and Cundrie la surziere. As women, they have no legal capacity to exact revenge in person and thereby give physical expression to their *zorn*. By the same token, they cannot be engaged in combat and thus called to account in the field for their words or actions. Their verbal attacks on Parzival thus place him in a quandary that he has not faced before and to which he can initially find no adequate response.

Parzival's encounter with Sigune after leaving the Grail Castle takes place in private. The tone of Sigune's conversation with Parzival changes abruptly after he admits to having failed to ask the question, and she curses him (255,2-20). Despite Parzival's entreaty 'tuo bezzeren willen gein mir schîn' (255,22), she signals her anger by terminating their meeting without any of the usual formalities (255,24-29), leaving Parzival sweating 'durch klage' as well as due to the heat (256,5), no doubt the sign of a dimly troubled conscience.<sup>73</sup>

In *Le Conte du Graal*, Perceval's unnamed cousin is certainly disappointed that he has not asked any questions at the Grail Castle (3554f.; 3571), but she does not shower him with insults nor abruptly terminate their conversation.<sup>74</sup> Instead, she announces to him 'comme correchie' (3580) that his name has changed from 'Perchevax li Galois' (3575) to 'Perchevax li chaitis [...] Perchevax maleüroux' (3582f.).<sup>75</sup>

#### 3.2.3.2 Cundrie la surziere's Reproach

Harsh words and unfriendly behaviour also characterize Cundrie la surziere's first appearance at the Arthurian court (312,2-319,20). However, whereas Sigune berated Parzival in private, Cundrie attacks him at the height of his fame (308,9) in front of Artus and his peers. Her words are enough to achieve complete public disgrace for Parzival, and he feels this acutely: 'ez ist ein strenge schärpf gerich / gein mir mit

<sup>73</sup> For cursing as a symptom of anger, see 1.2.2. The abandonment of social niceties is an abandonment of *zuht*, also associated with anger; see Thomasin's comments (1.6.2 above): 'Swer volget dem nide oder dem zorn, / der hât sîn zuht gar verlorn' (DWG 671f.). Compare the description of Cundrie la surziere: 'ir zuht was vertobt' (312,4).

<sup>74</sup> It should be borne in mind that Wolfram has Parzival meet Sigune four times (138,11-142,2; 249,11-255,30; 435,2-442,26; 804,21-805,2), whereas Perceval meets his unnamed cousin only once (3422-690).

<sup>75</sup> Kleiber 1978 does not discuss *Perceval* 3580. The context would permit the interpretation of *correchie* as either 'angered' or 'grief-stricken'.

worten hie getân' (330,10f.). Whereas in *Le Conte du Graal* there is no indication of the Hideous Damsel's emotional state (4613-717), Cundrie is upset (318,5-10) and obviously emotionally engaged by the Grail King's plight. Her anger is signalled not only by the string of curses that she heaps on Parzival, but also by the narrator's comment that 'ir zuht was vertobt' (312,4).<sup>76</sup>

### 3.2.3.3 Sigune's Forgiveness

After he has left Artus's court following Cundrie's verbal assault on him, Parzival remains in the background for a time whilst Gawain takes centre stage. There are references to Parzival's involvement at Bearosche (388,1-390,12; 392,20-393,6) and to his encounter with Vergulaht (424,15-425,14), from which we learn that Parzival continues to offer his services on the battlefield and to fight 'durch âventiure' (424,16).<sup>77</sup>

When Parzival meets Sigune for the third time, a scene without precedent in *Le Conte du Graal*, he accuses her 'du tuost gewalt [...] daz du vêhest mich' (441,15-17). She now indicates that she has abandoned her anger, saying 'al mîn gerich / sol ûf dich, neve, sîn verkorn' (441,18f.). She has thus given up the harsh words and unfriendly behaviour which were the only form of revenge available to her, the only way in which her anger could find expression.<sup>78</sup>

### 3.2.3.4 Parzival and the *templeis*

Once Parzival has left Artus's court, apart from his meeting with Sigune, we learn little about his state of mind up to the point where he encounters the *templeis*, a scene which has no parallel in *Le Conte du Graal*.

The *templeis* warns Parzival that he has come too close to Munsalvæsche (443,16f.). We are then told 'der helt bant mit zornes kraft / den helm ûfz houbet ebene' (443,26f.). This is an unmistakeable gesture of readiness to attack (Peil 1975: 149). In this context, 'mit zornes kraft' simply underlines the fact that this is a hostile gesture and implies a degree of *furor heroicus* (see 1.7.3 above). For the very first time, Parzival asks himself why his opponent is hostile:

er dâhte 'ich wære unernert,

<sup>76</sup> Compare Sigune's reaction (see 3.2.3.1 above).

<sup>77</sup> At Bearosche, Parzival fights in the service of Meljanz. When the latter is captured, Parzival decides to move on 'dô des ûzern hers gast / innen wart daz im gebrast / dienst Dankes von dem meister sîn' (388,11-13). He is therefore still very much concerned with reward for service.

<sup>78</sup> For anger as a 'desire of retaliation', see 1.2 above.

rit ich über diss mannes sât:  
wie wurde denn sîns zornes rât?' (444,4-6)

This is an important development and signals the onset of an inner change in Parzival: reflection is one of the essential prerequisites to controlling anger, as will be seen in the case of Gawain, discussed below.

### 3.2.3.5 Parzival and God

After Cundrie has denounced Parzival, Gawain commends him to God's care (331,25-30), prompting an angry outburst from Parzival against God:<sup>79</sup>

Der Wâleis sprach 'wê waz ist got?  
wær der gewaldec, sölhen spot  
het er uns pēden niht gegeben,  
kunde got mit kreften lebn.  
ich was im diens undertân,  
sît ich genâden mich versan.  
nu wil i'm dienst widersagn:  
hât er haz, den wil ich tragn. (332,1-8)

Parzival sees his relationship to God in secular terms, as that of a vassal to his lord, interpreting *triuwe* here in a purely feudal sense (Blamires 1966: 195). Faithful service has not been rewarded and Parzival therefore views their contract as terminated due to God's failure to deliver his side of the bargain.<sup>80</sup> The same sentiments are echoed in Parzival's words to Kahenis (447,25-30) and repeated in his thoughts as he decides to leave the company of Kahenis and his family (450,17-22). If faithful service cannot secure favour, he is prepared to bear God's disfavour.<sup>81</sup> This attitude is comprehensible in purely feudal terms, but is at odds with Christian dogma (see 1.5.1 above).

It is no coincidence that Parzival's path to Trevrizent's hermitage goes via the spot 'dâ Orilus zorn verdarp' (455,30), for the abandonment of *zorn* is, in fact, a central issue in Book IX of *Parzival*, which is widely acknowledged to be the pivotal section of the text (Hatto (trans.) 1980: 426).

The tone is set initially when Parzival comes upon Sigune for a third time and we are told 'sîn wolte got dô ruochen' (435,12). Sigune's forgiveness of Parzival (441,18f.)

<sup>79</sup> There are no comparable outbursts against God by Perceval — he is simply determined to establish who is served by the Grail and why the lance bleeds (*Perceval* 4727-40). By the time he arrives at the hermitage, Perceval has forgotten God (6237) and he confesses to the hermit that for five years 'Ne Dieu n'amai ne Dieu ne crui' (6366).

<sup>80</sup> Compare Keie's anger with Gawain (see 3.2.1.4 above), which results from Keie's perception that his faithful service of Gawain will not receive its due reward (298,19-28).

prefigures the absolution that will be granted by Trevrizent (501,17f.; 502,25f.).

Parzival's encounter with the *templeis* is also symbolic: his reflection on the motives of the *templeis* (444,4-6) marks a new willingness to consider the other's point of view. The encounter leaves him literally hanging over the edge of the abyss and forced to change horse (444,27-445,20), thus mirroring his inner state. Finally, in Kahenis, Parzival is presented with a knight ostensibly quite opposite to himself: Kahenis is old (446,10f.), accompanied by his wife and two daughters, dressed like himself in grey (446,13-19), and 'ûf ir bîhte verte' (446,16).<sup>82</sup> The contrast with Parzival could hardly be greater: indeed, Parzival's appearance is specifically contrasted with that of Kahenis (447,1-7).

Once again, Parzival is moved to reflection. Although still convinced that God is at fault (450,17-22), he begins to look at his situation in a different way:

alrêrste er dô gedâhte,  
wer al die werlt volbrâhte,  
an sînen schepfære,  
wie gewaltec der wære.  
er sprach 'waz ob got helfe phligt,  
diu mînem trûren an gesigt?  
wart ab er ie ritter holt,  
gedient ie ritter sînen solt,  
ode mac schilt unde swert  
sîner helfe sîn sô wert,  
und rehtiu manlîchiu wer,  
daz sîn helfe mich vor sorgen ner,  
ist hiut sîn helflîcher tac,  
sô helfe er, ob er helfen mac.' (451,9-22)

This passage shows that Parzival still thinks that he deserves to be rewarded, but it also suggests a mood of resignation. He gives God a chance to prove himself — not out of conviction that anything will necessarily come of this, but because he has nothing to lose by doing so.

Although there is no explicit statement to this effect in the text and it is not clear at exactly what point it happens, Parzival's *zorn* seems to disappear during his interview

---

<sup>81</sup> Compare the situation in Book VIII, where Kingrimursel complains to Vergulaht 'kunnet ir niht fürsten schönen, / wir krenken ouch die krönen' (415,21f.) and refers to the situation between himself and the king as 'der treit mit sünden mînen haz' (418,7). Behaviour which can be justified in the secular sphere (Nellmann 1994, II: 650 on 415,18-22) is inappropriate when transferred to the relationship between man and God.

with Trevrizent. The latter's strategy is one of gentle questioning: 'sagt mir mit kiuschen wizen, / wie der zorn sich an gevienc' (462,4f.). This is in keeping with the advice given to confessors in penitential handbooks.<sup>83</sup>

The interview proceeds in stages, as Trevrizent seeks both to reassure Parzival and to tease information from him. Initially, Trevrizent is at pains to put Parzival at ease, persuading him to dismount and to explain how he arrived at Fontâne la salvâtsche (456,5-457,20). He is able to reassure Parzival that he is unafraid of him as a human being and a knight and gives the first indication that he too has been involved in knightly activity (457,21-458,12).<sup>84</sup> A critical moment is now reached as Trevrizent asks Parzival to pass him the reins of his horse (458,13). Parzival's reluctance (458,20f.) suggests that little has changed as yet and highlights the possible interpretations that could be placed on this action: in the context of conflict, it would signal surrender; however, in the context of hospitality, it would be normal good manners.<sup>85</sup> It was precisely Parzival's attempt to grasp the reins of Ither's horse that led to *zorn* and bloodshed before (154,24-155,11). Trevrizent seems to anticipate Parzival's dilemma and successfully appeals to his *zuht*:

iwer zuht iu des niht giht,  
daz ir strîtet wider decheinen wirt,  
ob unfuoge iwer zuht verbirt. (458,22-24)

As has been seen already, *zuht* and *zorn* are incompatible.<sup>86</sup> Thus Trevrizent subtly steers Parzival away from an angry response.

---

<sup>82</sup> Kahenis and his family are dressed as penitents — see, for instance, the description in Regino of Prüm's early-tenth-century *De synodalibus causis et disciplinis ecclesiasticis*: 'At the beginning of Lent all penitents who are undertaking or have undertaken public penance shall present themselves to the bishop of the city before the doors of the church, clad in sackcloth, with bare feet, with their faces downcast toward the earth, by their very garb and countenance proclaiming themselves guilty' (McNeill and Gamer (trans.) 1938: 315). In due course, admission of guilt, contrition, and penance will be required of Parzival.

<sup>83</sup> The Prologue to the so-called *Roman Penitential of Halitgar*, for instance, exhorts bishops or presbyters to be 'solicitous on behalf of sinners, since we are "members one of another" and "if one member suffers anything, all the members suffer with it." And therefore, if we see anyone fallen in sin, let us also make haste to call him to penance by our teaching' (McNeill and Gamer (trans.) 1938: 297). The *Corrector* of Burchard of Worms suggests that 'the priest ought affectionately to address the penitent in these words: Brother, do not blush to confess thy sins, for I also am a sinner and perchance I have done worse deeds than thou hast' (McNeill and Gamer (trans.) 1938: 324). The latter citation seems particularly apt, since Trevrizent later describes his own failings (495,13-499,1).

<sup>84</sup> Trevrizent's comment 'ichn fürhte niht swaz menschlich ist: / ich hân ouch menschlichen list' (457,29f.) surely derives from the famous line by Terence 'homo sum; humani nil a me alienum puto' (*Heautontimorumenos* 77).

<sup>85</sup> Compare *EE*. 3963-69 and *Erec* 4629<sup>40</sup>-4629<sup>43</sup>. See also Peil 1975: 55f.

<sup>86</sup> See fn. 69 above.

Trevrizent now turns his attention to making Parzival comfortable (459,1-20). When the two of them move to a different chamber, Parzival recognizes the reliquary on which he swore his oath to Orilus and the spear which he used to defeat Segramors and Keie and is prompted to ask how long ago this took place (459,20-460,18). He thus recalls his first act of *suone* and his last feats of prowess before being arraigned by Cundrie. The revelation that four and a half years and three days have passed (460,19-27) prompts the sudden recognition in Parzival that he has spent all this time ‘wîselôs’ (460,29) and leads directly to his confession of his feelings towards God: ‘ouch trage ich hazzes vil gein gote: / wand er ist mîner sorgen tote’ (461,9f.).

Trevrizent deals with this by reassuring Parzival that God cannot and will not fail him or indeed either of them (461,27-462,1). He then begins to probe more deeply into the origins of origins of Parzival’s *zorn*, asking him to describe ‘wie der zorn sich an gevienc, / dâ von got iuern haz enpfîenc’ (462,5f.). The notion that anger gives rise to enmity is well-established.<sup>87</sup> Trevrizent now seeks to convince Parzival of the futility of anger and enmity towards God:

Irn megt im ab erzürnen niht:  
swer iuch gein im in hazze siht,  
der hât iuch an den wîzen kranc. (463,1-3)<sup>88</sup>

This is reinforced by the citation of two exempla: Lucifer (463,4-16) and Cain (463,17-30; 464,11-465,6), both associated with *zorn* towards God and both condemned to eternal damnation (see 1.5.2.1 and 1.5.2.3). These exempla give force to Trevrizent’s entreaty: ‘ir sult ûf in verkiesen, / welt ir sælde niht verliesen’ (465,11f.), and he warns Parzival specifically against a cycle of revenge:<sup>89</sup>

wan der sîn leit sô richet  
daz er unkiusche sprichet,  
von des lône tuon i’u kunt,  
in urteilt sîn selbes munt. (465,15-18)

<sup>87</sup> See 1.6.1, where the sentiment is expressed in the *Disticha Catonis*: ‘Litem inferre cave cum quo tibi gratia iuncta est, / ira odium generat, concordia nutrit amorem’ (I, 36). This is preserved in German as ‘Habe zorn keine vrist / mit dem dir gnâde gevüezet ist: / krieg und haz gebirt der zorn, / lieb wirt ûz ebenhelle geboren’ (*Cato* 219-22). Note also Salvian’s statement ‘ira mater est odii’ (see 1.3.1 above). The fourteenth-century *Fasciculus morum* begins the chapter *De membris ire* thus: ‘[C]irca eius membra est sciendum quod duo sunt specialiora, scilicet odium et vindicta; nam multi sunt hodie qui se armis materialibus vindicare non possunt, et ideo odium per iram induratum in corde retinent’ (Wenzel 1989: 118-21).

<sup>88</sup> ‘ab erzürnen’ here seems to mean ‘to force someone to do something against their will through anger’. See also 798,2-5: ‘grœzer wunder selten ie geschach, / sît ir ab got erzürnet hât / daz sîn endelôsiu Trinitât / iwers willen werhaft worden ist’.

<sup>89</sup> The possible consequences of incurring God’s wrath become all too clear when Trevrizent later describes the dire plight of the inhabitants of Munsalvaesche: ‘got hât zorn behalten / gein in alze lange dâ’ (493,28f.). Yet the promise that Anfortas will be healed under the right circumstances (i.e. when Parzival asks the question) implies God’s willingness to forgive and ultimately his love for mankind.



After a further allusion to Christ the Saviour and to God's great love, his omniscience and omnipotence, Trevrizent urges Parzival to change direction to the path of righteousness, pointing out that God 'ze bêden sîten ist bereit, / zer minne und gein dem zorne' (467,6f.).<sup>90</sup> God's love is thus contrasted with his wrath (see 1.5.2.4.). Parzival is therefore in a position to choose between carrot and stick and Trevrizent incites him 'nu prüevet wederz helfe baz' (466,10), speaking to him 'Von dem wâren minnære' (466,1) who 'wenket sîner minne niht' (466,4). The strong implication is that Parzival would be mad to prefer God's wrath to his love: 'swer iuch gein im in hazze siht, / der hât iuch an den wizen kranc' (463,2f.).

Parzival's reference to his *kumber* (467,18) now opens the way for Trevrizent to enquire more deeply into his troubles, which are the origin of his *zorn*. The revelation of Parzival's concern for his wife and for the *gral* (467,26-30) prompts a judicious mix of praise followed by gentle criticism from Trevrizent (468,1-16). At this point (468,19f.), Parzival is not yet ready to reveal that he was at Munsalvaesche and failed to ask the question. However, Trevrizent is able to give him a lot of information about the *gral* (468,23-471,29), which leads directly to Parzival's assertion that he feels he has earned the right to be called to the *gral* (472,1-11).

This is another critical point in the proceedings, for Parzival is still inwardly convinced of his own righteousness. There is therefore a risk that he will relapse into *zorn* and *haz* towards God if his reward is not now forthcoming. Trevrizent homes in immediately on Parzival's preoccupation with his personal worth with a warning against pride (472,13-17), the sin of *superbia*, which is the root of all other sins (see 1.3.1 above) and undoubtedly at the root of Parzival's *zorn*. This is the climax of Trevrizent's enquiries, underlined by the fact that he bursts into tears (472,18-20) as he prepares to illustrate this advice with reference to his own brother, Anfortas (472,21-473,5).<sup>91</sup> The hermit alludes to two uninvited guests at Munsalvaesche: an unnamed 'tumber man'

<sup>90</sup> This picture of God as bearing both love and anger towards mankind reiterates Trevrizent's earlier statement: 'al der werlde ist geveilet / bêdiu sîn minne und ouch sîn haz' (466,8f.).

<sup>91</sup> The penitentials often make reference to groaning and weeping by the confessor. The so-called Roman Penitential of Halitgar states: 'Moreover, he who on coming to penance sees the priest sad and weeping for his evil deeds, being himself the more moved by the fear of God, will be the more grieved and abhor his sins' (McNeill and Gamer (trans.) 1938: 298). Regino of Prüm suggests 'When bishops or presbyters receive the confessions of the faithful they ought to humble themselves and pray with groans of sorrow and with tears not only for their own faults but also for their brother's fall. For the Apostle saith: "Who is weak and I am not weak? (II Corinthians 11.29)"' (McNeill and Gamer (trans.) 1938: 315).

(473,13) and Lähelin (473,22-30), and seeks to narrow the field by asking Parzival if he is the latter (474,1).

This now leads directly to Parzival revealing his identity and confessing to the killing of Ither and the removal of Ither's armour (474,25-475,12). Trevrizent immediately laments this, informing Parzival that he has killed a relative and also that he is responsible for the death of his mother (475,13-476,13). This is then followed by more details of Parzival's family, with a detailed account of Anfortas's plight and of the frantic attempts to cure his wound (476,23-484,30). Once again, Trevrizent refers to the unnamed visitor who failed to ask the question (484,21-30), paving the way for Parzival to confess to being that man. After a brief interval in which the two men mourn together (485,1), practise abstinence together (485,20-487,4) and tend Parzival's horse together (487,23-30), Parzival finally confesses what happened at Munsalvaesche (488,1-20).<sup>92</sup> From his choice of words — 'daz verkiest durch iwer selbes zuht' (488,7) — it is clear that Parzival anticipates the hermit's anger at this revelation.

Trevrizent does not want to underplay the seriousness of what has happened (488,21-30), but he sees a danger of falling into *desperatio* and immediately warns against lamenting too intensively (489,1-4), repeatedly declaring his intent to stand by Parzival (489,1; 489,21). Subsequent discussions between the two men have the effect of filling in gaps in their knowledge of events and also give Trevrizent the opportunity to expand on his own experience of knighthood (495,13-499,10). Recapping Parzival's 'zwuo grôze sünde' (499,20), namely the death of Ither and of Herzeloyde, which cannot be corrected, Trevrizent advises penance as a means to inner peace (499,26-30). His subsequent enquiry about Parzival's horse (500,1-4) is obviously intended to ensure that Parzival has no other misdemeanours to declare. The final reference to Parzival's failure to ask the question — 'die sünde lâ bi dn andern stên' (501,5) — seems to suggest a desire on Trevrizent's part not to overburden Parzival with guilt.

There is no subsequent reference to any residual anger towards God on Parzival's part and there can be little doubt that this is due to Trevrizent's tactful and successful hearing of Parzival's confession, for we are told:

Parzivâl die swære  
truoc durch süeziu mære,  
wand in der wirt von sünden schiet  
unt im doch rîterlîchen riet. (501,15-18)

<sup>92</sup> Reference has already been made to the importance of weeping, see fn. 91 above. Trevrizent and Parzival eventually spend fifteen days abstaining together (501,11-14).

Parzival's anger towards God is thus to be reckoned as a sin in this context. It is replaced by a new-found faith in God<sup>93</sup> and a recognition that hostility towards God on the grounds of His unfaithfulness is unjustified.

### 3.2.4 Parzival's Path Towards Redemption

#### 3.2.4.1 Parzival and Gawan

Parzival's encounter with Gawan, which has no precedent in the unfinished *Conte du Graal*, shows certain similarities to his encounter with Ither. In both cases, a man rides out alone to face a red knight in open country. Thus 'al ein reit mîn hêr Gâwân / von dem her verre ûf den plân' (678,15f.) equates to Parzival's departure from Artus's court: 'Des reise al eine wart getân / hin ûz gein Ithêr ûf den plân' (153,23f.). In both cases, two relatives fight unbeknown to each other. The narrator emphasizes the combatants' isolation — 'Dane was dennoch nieman wan sie' (681,1) — precisely at the moment where he breaks off to describe how Artus's messengers handled their embassy to Gramoflanz (681,2-688,3), thus heightening the tension. The reader/audience is left wondering whether history is about to repeat itself. Will *zorn* get the better of one or both of the combatants with tragic results? In fact, Gawan's defeat is averted purely by the arrival of Artus's messengers, whose cries identify him to his opponent (688,11-18).

Parzival certainly feels that history has indeed repeated itself: 'Sus sint diu alten wâpen mîn / ê dicke und aber worden schîn' (689,1f.). The irony of the situation has already been made clear by the narrator:

erkantiu sippe unt hôch geselleschaft  
was dâ mit hazlicher kraft  
durch scharpfen strît zein ander komen. (680,13-15)

This is now confirmed by Gawan: 'hie hânt zwei herzen einvalt / mit hazze erzeiget ir gewalt' (689,27f.). Thus *haz* has been in evidence, when its exact opposite would have been more appropriate. There is a literal sense in which the phrase 'Du hânt dir selben an gesigt' (690,1) is true.<sup>94</sup> However, it is also reminiscent of Proverbs 16.32: 'Melior est patiens viro forti: et qui dominatur animo suo, expugnatore urbium' (Duckworth 1985: 144). Whereas Parzival's encounter with a red knight (Ither) was marked by *zorn*, Gawan's encounter with a red knight (Parzival) is marked by enmity (*haz*), but not *zorn*. Gawan's remark (690,1) is therefore true in two senses: not only has Parzival gained the

<sup>93</sup> See the narrator's later remarks at 741,26-30.

<sup>94</sup> Wolfram makes much of the oneness of relatives (Nellmann 1994, II: 750 on 689,5).

upper hand over his friend and relative, but he has also gained the upper hand over his anger.

### 3.2.4.2 Parzival and Gramoflanz

Parzival's encounter with Gramoflanz is relatively briefly described (703,21-704,30; 705,15-707,14). Although this 'nîtspil' (706,4) does provide further breathing space to enable a reconciliation between Gawan and Gramoflanz to take place, this is expressly not Parzival's intention: 'ob erz welle süenen? / dem gebârt er ungelîche' (704,26f.). On the contrary, Parzival is more intent on fighting (704,28f.). However, the encounter does have the important side-effect of teaching Gramoflanz a lesson:

er het in underwîset  
einer zuht die man noch prîset:  
ern genam sît nimmer mêre  
mit rede an sich die êre  
daz er zwein mannen bûte strît,  
wan einers im ze vil dâ gît. (705,25-30)

In order to appreciate the full significance of this, it is necessary to consider the character of Gramoflanz in more detail.

Gramoflanz is described by Orgeluse as 'der zornege kûnec' (664,13), a description which is never applied to Guiromelant, the equivalent character in *Le Conte du Graal*.<sup>95</sup> Indeed, particular stress is laid on Gramoflanz's rank as king.<sup>96</sup> The other two relevant facts about Gramoflanz are that he jealously guards a tree in his territory (603,26-29) and he never fights less than two men at once:<sup>97</sup>

sîn muot durch hôchvart in twanc,  
swie vil im ein man tet leit,  
daz er doch mit dem niht streit,  
irn wæren zwêne oder mêr.

<sup>95</sup> Comparison is complicated by the fact that Chrétien's tale breaks off soon after Gauvain's first encounter with Guiromelant. Although the French character announces his name as Guiromelant (*Perceval* 8627), he is subsequently always referred to as 'li Guiromelans' (8653, 8659, 8713, 9040, 9124) (Busby 1993: 531 on 8653).

<sup>96</sup> He is referred to as 'roys Gramoflanz' (445,23; 586,23; 632,27; 701,1; 727,25), 'fil li roy Irôt' (604,19), 'Irôtes kint' (712,14), and 'der kûnec Gramoflanz' (603,29; 604,21; 605,23; 608,13; 613,29; 631,19; 634,26; 650,13; 664,13; 677,4; 681,5; 681,30; 683,3; 691,17; 692,19; 696,25; 703,1; 705,19; 706,13; 711,11; 713,3; 717,5; 719,20; 724,2; 725,3; 728,11; 731,13; 765,10; 785,1). There are also more than fifty references to him simply as 'der kûnec'. Guiromelant is simply 'un chevalier' (*Perceval* 8536, 8538, 8540, 8932, 9012, 9122), although he does not hold his city, Orqueeles, in fief from any superior lord (*Perceval* 8621-26) and later refers to his territory as 'mon roialme' (*Perceval* 8857).

<sup>97</sup> Guiromelant seems unconcerned that Gauvain has taken a wreath from his tree. There is also no suggestion that Guiromelant will not deign to fight fewer than two opponents. In fact, far from the haughty attitude of Gramoflanz, Guiromelant displays spontaneous humility by prostrating himself at Gauvain's feet when he realizes that the latter has indeed survived the ordeal of the Lit de la Merveille (*Perceval* 8713-17). In *Parzival*, Gramoflanz's repeatedly stressed disdain for single opponents has the effect of bolstering Gawan's reputation when it is revealed that he is willing to make an exception for Gawan (608,14-21).

sîn hôhez herze was sô hêr,  
 swaz im tet ein man,  
 den wolter âne strît doch lân. (604,12-18)

The emphasis given to this information and the alliteration in 604,16 all point to its significance: Gramoflanz is characterized not only by *zorn*, but also by *hôchvart*. His determination to fight only against two or more opponents flies in the face of proverbial wisdom that one man should not fight against two.<sup>98</sup> His pride is also stressed by Gawan, when the latter promises Orgeluse that he will teach Gramoflanz a lesson: ‘ich lère den küneec sölhe nôt / diu sîne hôchvart letzet’ (614,20f.).<sup>99</sup> Artus also interprets Gramoflanz’s challenge to Gawan as pride:

daz der küneec Gramoflanz  
 hôchvart mit lôsheit ganz  
 gein mîme künne bieten kan! (650,13-15)<sup>100</sup>

Furthermore, Gramoflanz’s appearance and dress, which are described in detail, contribute to an image of pride.<sup>101</sup> From the outset, he is dressed in clothes that bespeak opulence and the height of fashion. He wears a peacock-feather hat from Sinzester (722,17-19)<sup>102</sup> and an ermine-lined cloak that reaches right down to the ground (605,10-14).<sup>103</sup> However, perhaps the most telling image of him is found later, when he sits under a baldachin on a bed furnished with costly materials and we are specifically told

<sup>98</sup> Yeandle (1984: 323f.) on 131,20 and Okken (1993: 350) on *Iwein* 4328f. list a number of variations on this theme, including ‘duo sunt exercitus uni’ (*Ysengrimus* 311) and ‘noli pugnare duobus’ (Catullus 62,64). Poem 62 is the only Catullus poem for which there is a pre-fifteenth-century witness (Thomson 1997: 23). However, the proverb is much more ancient (Thomson 1997: 370) and can be found in the works of Plato, e.g. *Phaedo* 89c: ‘they say that not even Heracles could fight two people’, and *Laws* 11.919b ‘The old saying is quite right: it’s difficult to fight against two enemies’.

<sup>99</sup> Although Parzival eventually all but triumphs over Gawan (688,11-18), he appears to Gramoflanz to have the strength of six men (705,21f.). The possibility therefore remains that Gawan would have been capable of teaching Gramoflanz a lesson, but he is not called upon to do so.

<sup>100</sup> *lôsheit* is another quality often associated by Wolfram with pride and *zorn*. It is conspicuously absent from Herzeloide: ‘si kêrt sich niht an lôsheit: diemuot was ir bereit’ (113,15f.). *diemuot* is the natural opposite of pride and represents its antidote, according to the ‘Doctrine of Contraries’ (see 1.3.2), as Trevrizent emphasizes to Parzival: ‘dâ muoz der rîter unt der kneht / bewart sîn vor lôsheit. / diemüet ie hôchvart überstreit’ (473,2-4). The connection to *zorn* becomes clear in Book VII, when the narrator laments the fatal consequences of Obie’s anger: ‘swelch wert man dâ den lîp verlôs, / Obîen zorn unsanfte er kôs, / wande ir tumbiu lôsheit / vil liute brâht in arbeit’ (386,15-18). Thus *lôsheit* appears to represent a lack of restraint that has its origin in pride and may find its expression in anger or other immoderate behaviour. Such an interpretation would appear to be supported by the other occurrences of this word in *Parzival* (737,18 and 749,28).

<sup>101</sup> See Lerchner 1993: 376, also Hempel 1970: 209. Guiromelant is more handsome than words can describe (*Perceval* 8540f.), which is never said of Gramoflanz, but his dress and demeanour are not described.

<sup>102</sup> For the popularity of hats adorned with peacock feathers in courtly literature of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, see Brüggén 1989: 227f. (under ‘huot’).

<sup>103</sup> Brüggén (1989: 81f.) points out that great length is one of the stereotypical attributes of the cloak in literature and that such fullness implies a considerable quantity of material with consequent expense.

that the messengers address him ‘der hôchverte hort / truoc’ (683,25f.).<sup>104</sup> Even after his marriage to Itonje, Gramoflanz is moved by ‘hôchverte nôt’ (731,14) to summon his men in order to give an impression of splendour.

Since pride is the root of all sin (see 1.3.1 above), Gramoflanz’s *zorn* may be seen as a symptom of his pride. In this respect, Gramoflanz resembles Parzival, whose *zorn* also derives from *superbia* (see 3.2.3.5 above).<sup>105</sup> The combat between the two is in that sense a contest between Parzival and an extreme version of his former self. However, Orgeluse’s description of Gramoflanz as ‘der zornege künece’ (664,13) may be based on her previous knowledge of him as the killer of her husband, Cidegast (612,28-613,30), which started a chain of events leading to the downfall of Anfortas (615,27-617,3). Gramoflanz himself confesses how he abducted Orgeluse after killing Cidegast and held her captive for a year (606,6-14). Furthermore, when Parzival offers to fight Gramoflanz on Gawan’s behalf, he says to the king: ‘welt ir zürnen gein im kêrn, / daz sol ich iu mit swerten wern’ (693,11f.). Thus *zornec* may simply describe Gramoflanz’s aggressive tendencies.<sup>106</sup>

Parzival’s ultimate victory over Gramoflanz prompts Artus to remark ‘nu darf Gâwân des zürnen niht, / swaz man dir drumbe prîses giht’ (708,13f.). This not only emphasizes Parzival’s achievement but also draws attention to the potential for Parzival’s actions to provoke anger arising from jealousy (*invidia*) in Gawan. However, although he is still keen to fight Gramoflanz, Gawan is not in the least jealous of Parzival: ‘mir ist niht leit / mîns neven hôhiu werdekeit’ (708,15f.), thus illustrating once again his calm nature and general disinclination to espouse anger.<sup>107</sup>

### 3.2.4.3 Parzival and Feirefiz

After his encounters with Gawan and Gramoflanz, Parzival’s final combat is with his elder half-brother, Feirefiz. It is perhaps significant that lion imagery is prominent in this episode, as lions are often associated with *zorn* (see 1.2.5.2 above). Initially, the narrator laments the meeting of the two brothers:

<sup>104</sup> Lerchner (1993: 375f.) draws attention to the importance of the baldachin as a symbol of power originating from the East, and to the opulence of the bed’s trimmings.

<sup>105</sup> Repeated references to the fact that Gramoflanz is seeking recompense or revenge for his wreath (610,21-24; 664,14; 683,3f.; 691,18; 693,15) support the idea that he is motivated by a ‘desire of retaliation or revenge’ and is thus genuinely angry (see 1.2.2 above).

<sup>106</sup> In *Willehalm*, Terramer’s besieging army is described as *zornic* (108,30), which Decke-Cornill (1985: 27) glosses as ‘kampfwillig, angriffs-lustig’.

<sup>107</sup> According to Gregory the Great, *invidia* would lead naturally to *ira* (see 1.3.1 above).

hie wellnt ein ander vâren  
 die mit kiusche leंबर wâren  
 und lewen an der vrechheit. (737,19-21)<sup>108</sup>

Subsequently, the narrator adds:

den lewen sîn muoter tât gebirt:  
 von sîns vater galme er lebendec wirt.  
 dise zwêne wârn ûz krache erborn. (738,19-21)

The implication of this lion imagery seems to be that both men have a tremendous capacity for *furor heroicus*, inherited from their father (Freytag 1972: 42 and 77-79; Green 1980: 144f.). At this stage, Feirefiz's identity has not yet been revealed, but the lion imagery suggests that this is a contest between brothers and this is soon confirmed by the narrator: 'si wârn doch bêde eins mannes kint' (740,5).

It is Feirefiz rather than Parzival who is able to bring about a non-violent resolution of this potentially fatal episode (740,17f.; 744,21-24).<sup>109</sup> Parzival is unwilling to identify himself (745,22-24), even though the loss of Ither's sword means that his defeat is unavoidable, as Feirefiz points out (747,2-11). Feirefiz therefore identifies himself first (745,25-30) and throws away his own sword (747,14-16). By posing questions and volunteering unsolicited information, Feirefiz averts tragedy: a reversal of Parzival's situation on his first visit to the Grail Castle (where Parzival, again in contrast, accepts a sword).

The realization that they are brothers enables Parzival and Feirefiz to become friends and set aside enmity:

Feirefiz unt Parzivâl  
 mit kusse understuonden haz:  
 in zam ouch bêden friuntschaft baz  
 dan gein ein ander herzen nît. (748,8-11)

This is further symbolized when Parzival returns his brother's sword to its sheath and we are told: 'dâ wart von in beiden / zornlîcher haz vermiten' (754,26f.).<sup>110</sup> However, it is, in fact, the magnanimity of the victor that enables matters to be resolved peaceably.<sup>111</sup> Feirefiz here goes beyond Gurnemanz's advice to spare an opponent who offers his surrender (171,25-30) and demonstrates the virtue of discretion.

<sup>108</sup> For the history of the pairing 'lion and lamb', see Freytag 1972: 78, fn. 26.

<sup>109</sup> References to *haz* are to the natural enmity between combatants (738,13; 739,7; 748,9; 754,27; 760,6).

<sup>110</sup> As in Parzival's encounter with Gawan (see 3.2.4.1 above), Parzival's encounter with Feirefiz is characterized by enmity (*haz*), but not *zorn*.

<sup>111</sup> This is also true of Gawan's combat with Lischoys (536,10-543,26). Compare also Erec's combat with Mabonagrîn (see 2.1.5.5 above).

### 3.2.4.4 Cundrie la surziere's Forgiveness

When Cundrie appears before Artus and the queen for a second time, another scene unparalleled in the unfinished *Conte du Graal*, we are told that she 'warp daz ein räche / ûf si verkorn wære' (779,12f.), thus indicating that she knows she has incurred Parzival's *zorn*. She then falls at Parzival's feet:

si warp al weinde umb sînen gruoꝛ,  
sô daz er zorn gein ir verlûr  
und âne kus ûf si verkûr. (779,24-26)

It transpires that Parzival has, indeed, been bearing a grudge against Cundrie — 'Parzivâl truoc ûf si haz' (779,29), but at the prompting of Artus and Feirefiz, he agrees to let it go: 'durch friunde bet er des vergaz' (779,30). As soon as he has done this, Cundrie announces that he, Condwiramurs and Loherangrin have all been called to the Grail (781,3-19).

Parzival's reconciliation with Cundrie marks the final stage in his abandonment of *zorn*: his forgiveness of the woman who was the harbinger of his greatest sorrow. However, his abandonment of *zorn* and *haz* towards Cundrie involves a public admission of guilt. He accepts that Cundrie's *zorn* was justified because he had done wrong: 'iedoch het ich niht missetân, / ir het mich zorns etswenne erlân' (783,13f.). Admission of guilt and forgiveness of others are thus portrayed as important stages in Parzival's accession to the Grail Kingdom.

### 3.2.4.5 Trevrizent's 'Retraction'

After Parzival has returned to the Grail Castle and asked the question (795,29), leading to Anfortas's cure (795,30-796,16), he rides out to Trevrizent's hermitage to pass on the good news (797,16-22). This prompts Trevrizent to utter his so-called 'Retraction', which includes the following statement:

grœzer wunder selten ie geschach,  
sît ir ab got erzûrnet hât  
daz sîn endelôsiu Trinitât  
iwers willen werhaft worden ist. (798,2-5)

This has given rise to much debate, since Trevrizent here appears to contradict his earlier statement 'irn megt im ab erzûrnen niht' (463,1). As Nellmann (1994, II: 776) has noted, it cannot be correct that Parzival has wrested any sort of concession from God through anger, since there is no sign of Parzival's anger towards God after Book IX. Indeed, in the context of his combat with Feirefiz, the narrator refers to Parzival's trust in God since his departure from Trevrizent (744,26-30), and Parzival himself



confirms the essence of Trevrizent's original argument shortly before the 'Retraction' (786,3-12).

Trevrizent's reference to *ab erzürnen* at 798,2 recalls his earlier statement (463,1). At that earlier point, Trevrizent held before Parzival the spectre of Lucifer and his cronies, condemned by their hostility to God to eternal damnation: 'ir endelôser strît / zer helle enpfâhet sûren lôn' (463,8f.). Parzival's case therefore elicits Trevrizent's surprise at his success: 'ez was ie ungewonheit, / daz den grâl ze keinen zîten / iemen möhte erstrîten' (798,24-26). However, whereas Lucifer is forever at odds with the Trinity (471,16f.), Parzival genuflects three times in honour of the Trinity before asking the vital question of Anfortas (795,24-29). It would therefore seem that inner attitude rather than outward posture is the critical factor in Parzival's success. Nevertheless, the precise reason for Parzival's success remains a mystery, in accordance with Trevrizent's very first words on hearing the news: 'got vil tougen hât' (797,23). Trevrizent's 'Retraction' merely reaffirms his human fallibility (Groos 1981).<sup>112</sup>

### 3.2.5 Conclusions

Wolfram's account of Parzival's youth introduces a new aspect of *zorn*, namely its association with impatience. The knights accompanying Karnahkarnanz set Parzival a bad example in this respect and the boy replicates their impatience and anger in his quest to become a knight and to acquire the arms of Ither. This is shown to have spectacularly disastrous results, leading directly to the death of Ither. This, in turn, provides a very clear example of *zorn* leading to actions that are later regretted. There is also a strong implication that anger needs to be controlled, as stated by Thomasin (see 1.6.2 above).

Herzeloide's suggestion that Parzival should not be angry if an old, wise man offers him advice does not provide the guidance that he needs on the wider uses and abuses of anger. Although Gregory the Great envisaged a place for anger as a corrective force (see 1.7 above), Keie illustrates the point that it still needs to be applied with discretion and in moderation. In spite of his apparent good intentions to uphold the honour of the court, Keie's angry beating of Cunneware and Antanor demonstrates that no joy can come of anger and that *zorn* leads to *unfuoge* (152,18) and is therefore incompatible with *zuht*.

---

<sup>112</sup> Any deliberate lie (798,6) would seem to relate to the doctrine of the neutral angels rather than the principle of whether God's hand can be forced (Schirok 1987).

There are plenty of examples of anger as a ‘desire of retaliation’, usually as a reaction to a perceived loss of honour. Thus Orilus feels moved to defend the honour of his wife, whilst Ither reacts to the affront of being challenged by an ungainly youth, and Clamide is wounded by Condwiramurs’s rejection. It is also possible that Lähelin is still smarting from his earlier defeat by Gahmuret and that this lies behind his seizure of Gahmuret’s lands. Furthermore, Keie escapes from retaliation by Orilus and/or Lähelin only because neither of the brothers is on hand when he beats Cunneware.

In cases of retaliation, violent emotion is seen to lead to violent action, which often results in death. In the case of the brothers Orilus and Lähelin, their fiery temperament seems to be symbolized by their dragon emblem and both have been responsible for a number of deaths in the past. Similarly, Ither’s violent reaction to Parzival’s demands provokes anger and further violence from Parzival, leading to his own death. In Clamide’s case, his anger finds expression in the aggression of his army in the field and the heavy death toll is alluded to on more than one occasion (182,7-10; 194,21-25; 195,16f. etc.). This connection between anger and violence is noted by Thomasin: ‘böser schimph macht haz, zorn, nôt, / zorn vîntschaft, vîntschaft tôt’ (DWG 667f.) (see 1.6.2 above).

However, *zorn* represents not only a physical danger to life and limb but also a moral danger. The idea of *zorn* as a sin is most clearly expressed in Parzival’s anger towards God. Although to some extent this can be seen as a ‘desire of retaliation’, since Parzival seems to feel that God has failed to meet his obligations, Trevrizent emphasizes the futility of such anger and traces Parzival’s problems back to *hôchvart*, the traditional root of all sin (see 1.3.1 above). *Hôchvart* is also associated with Clamide (215,18) and particularly with Gramoflanz (see 3.2.4.2), both of whom are also connected with *zorn*. Another vice frequently associated with anger is *lôsheit*, or lack of control, which Trevrizent also identifies as a particular threat to knights: ‘dâ muoz der rîter unt der kneht / bewart sîn vor lôsheit’ (473,2f.).<sup>113</sup>

Sometimes *zorn* simply represents *furor heroicus* (see 1.7.3 above), the natural aggression felt between opponents on the battlefield. This seems to be the case in Parzival’s encounter with the *templeis* and also seems to be implied in the combat between Parzival and Feirefiz, where both combatants are compared to lions. However,

---

<sup>113</sup> Gramoflanz is associated with *lôsheit* (650,14), whereas both Gahmuret (13,8) and Herzeloyde (113,15) are free of it.

in the case of Orilus, his *zorn* towards Jeschute is expressed through her public humiliation and makes a social statement about the relationship between man and wife, comparable to the *zorn* manifested by Erec towards Enite (see 2.1.2 above). The difference lies in the fact that Orilus has concrete grounds for suspecting that his wife's honour has been impugned, although the reader/audience knows this to be untrue. Erec, on the other hand, is motivated by concern for his own honour, rather than by anything that Enite may have done.

The incompatibility of *zorn* and *zuht*, emphasized by Thomasin (see 1.6.2 above), is evident on several occasions, particularly in Parzival's encounter with the *redespæher man* and in the reactions of Sigune and Cundrie to Parzival's failure to ask the question during his first visit to the Grail Castle. Parzival's angry reaction to the *redespæher man* demonstrates his inability to distinguish situations where anger is inappropriate and foreshadows his failure, whereas Sigune and Cundrie give vent to their anger through their harsh words to Parzival. He, in turn, is at a loss as to how he should respond and ultimately takes his frustration out on God, who appears to have let him down by allowing this situation to develop. Trevrizent's appeal to Parzival's *zuht* (458,22-24) can therefore be seen as a ploy to avert an angry reaction from the latter.

One of the main counters to *zorn* is already evident in Parzival's encounter with the *templeis*. Although Parzival quickly decides that it is appropriate for him to respond to the challenge from the *templeis*, the moment of reflection beforehand, in which he considers whether his opponent's aggression might be justified (444,4-6), marks a new departure.

Indeed, reflection by Parzival is a key issue in his meeting with Trevrizent. Parzival's killing of Ither and his reaction to the *redespæher man* both point to the importance of being slow to anger, in accordance with biblical precepts (see 1.5.1 above), to allow time for this reflection to take place. Keie, on the other hand, demonstrates a negative side to reflection. He provides a classic example of a man of choleric temperament, nursing a deeply held grievance over a considerable period of time. He is not only quick to anger, as when he beats Cunneware and Antanor, but also slow to forget, as his simmering hostility to Gawan demonstrates.

Other counters to anger include *patientia*, the classic remedy for *ira* according to the 'Doctrine of Contraries' (see 1.3.2 above). Gawan's acceptance of Parzival's prowess against Gramoflanz hints at his particular capacity for this virtue. Discretion in the

application of the rules of combat also emerges as a way of defusing conflict, as shown by Feirefiz's decision to name himself after defeating Parzival.

Just as Gahmuret was able to reconcile Hardiz and Kaylet after he had defeated Hardiz on the battlefield, so Parzival is able to reconcile Orilus and Jeschute after defeating Orilus. However, whereas the consequences of Gahmuret's actions are glossed over, when Orilus and Jeschute return to their tent, their retainers are 'al gelîche geil / daz suone was worden schîn / gein der sældebernden herzogîn' (271,28-30). Artus is also pleased with the outcome (278,2-5). Reconciliation is thus preferable to conflict and is more conducive to *vreude*.

On a similar note, *minne* is consistently presented as preferable to *haz* and *zorn*. This is particularly true in man's relationship to God, as explained by Trevrizent. However, it also emerges from Parzival's combats with Gawan and with Feirefiz.

### 3.3 The Gawan Story (298,1-432,30; 503,1-731,30)

Again, comparison with *Le Conte du Graal* is limited by the unfinished nature of Chrétien's text. Gawan seems to serve as a foil for Parzival, moving into the foreground just as Parzival moves into the background at the end of Book VI, then ceding the limelight to Parzival again after their encounter in Book XIV. This is not out of keeping with the French text, but Gawan's character is much more sharply defined than that of Gauvain, and the situations that he encounters are subtly altered in order to bring out particular facets of that character.

At the beginning of Book VII, the narrator sets the scene:

Der nie gewarp nâch schanden,  
ein wîl zuo sînen handen  
sol nu dise âventiure hân  
der werde erkande Gâwân. (338,1-4)

Thus Gawan is presented as 'one who never did a shameful deed' and 'famed as a man of worth' (Hatto (trans.) 1980: 176). He enters the action as a fully rounded character with an apparently spotless reputation, well versed in all aspects of chivalry and courtly behaviour.<sup>114</sup> Yet he never fully eclipses Parzival, who is specifically referred to as 'des mæres hêren' (338,7) at this juncture.

<sup>114</sup> For the role of Gawan in *Parzival*, see Jones 1999, also Mohr's three articles (1957, 1958, and 1965).

### 3.3.1 Gawan: Book VI

Wolfram carefully prepares the reader/audience for Gawan's appearance in Book VI. The very first reference to Gawan at Kanvoleis (66,15-22), without precedent in *Le Conte du Graal*, illustrates his early inclination towards knightly deeds and his familiarity with the nature of knighthood and with what is expected of him. Furthermore, his very presence at Kanvoleis may be taken as evidence of his education in knightly prowess. His youth is thus in one sense similar to that of Parzival, whose 'strîtes ger' (120,23) compares to Gawan's 'ger' (66,22). However, in another sense, Gawan's upbringing is quite opposite to Parzival's, since the latter is 'an kûneclîcher fuore betrogn' (118,2). A second reference to Gawan, again without precedent, occurs when Clamide specifically seeks his company at Artus's court (220,30-221,9), serving to remind us of Gawan's pre-eminent position at the Arthurian court.<sup>115</sup>

However, it is in Book VI that Gawan enters the action proper, defusing the potentially dangerous situation that arises when Parzival arrives at the Plimizoel and halts within sight of Artus's encampment. This is, in fact, the first example of many in which Gawan demonstrates his skill at dealing with aggression and anger in others and at retaining his own composure. In this, he is the complete opposite of the inexperienced Parzival, whose emotional responses are barely contained by the constraints of chivalric etiquette, as learnt from Gurnemanz.

Parzival's stance at the Plimizoel is unintentionally aggressive, since he is actually lost in thought about Condwiramurs. However, the fact that he is fully armed and mounted 'mit ûf gerihtem sper' (284,3; 290,12) is seen as provocation. Gawan's reaction contrasts sharply with that of Segramors and Keie. Segramors is the archetypal hothead (284,30-285,10).<sup>116</sup> His urge to do battle overrides all other considerations and leads to him rushing into the royal tent and pulling back the bedcovers in his haste to be awarded the joust with Parzival (285,11-30).<sup>117</sup> At this point, Segramors resembles Parzival in more ways than one. Wolfram stresses his youth (286,23), his royal status

<sup>115</sup> A third reference to Gawan amongst the press around Orilus after the latter has surrendered to Cunneware and revealed his identity (277,4-10) seems to nod to the fact that, in *Le Conte du Graal*, this is the point at which Gauvain is introduced and speaks for the first time, prompting the King to go in search of Perceval (*Perceval* 4086-95). It also keeps Gawan in the mind's eye.

<sup>116</sup> In *Le Conte du Graal*, Sagremor is called 'Desreez' (4221), but the only things that might justify this epithet are his swift response to the news of Perceval's presence (4230f.) and his anger when Perceval fails to reply (4248). Points of comparison with Perceval or contrast with Gauvain are less obvious. See Kleiber 1978: 342 for *Perceval* 4248 as an example of *ire-colère*.

<sup>117</sup> For impatience as a sign of anger, see Prudentius's description of *Ira* at 1.3.3 above.

(286,25) and his resemblance to a falcon (286,27-287,4).<sup>118</sup> Just as Parzival's encroachment on Artus's territory is announced to the Round Table as 'iu ist durch die snüere alhie gerant' (284,22), so Segradors's incursion into Artus's tent is described as 'Segradors im durch die snüere lief' (285,14). Furthermore, Segradors is 'der unbescheiden helt' (287,5).<sup>119</sup> He is unceremoniously unhorsed by Parzival but is still proud of his reputation as a knight (289,23-290,2), much as Parzival later clings to his knightly achievements after Cundrie casts aspersions on his character.

Keie is quite different to Segradors, since his concern is principally with the reputation of the court (290,8-21).<sup>120</sup> He recognizes that Parzival is in some sort of trance but attempts to rouse him from this state by force (294,10-20). However, like Segradors, Keie also has similarities with Parzival. When Parzival unhorses him, he is propelled over the same tree trunk that had earlier saved the goose from Artus's escaped falcon (282,15-19; 295,17-19). Although Parzival seems to be initially identified with the falcon (see above), he can also be identified with the goose.<sup>121</sup> Furthermore, like Parzival at this stage, Keie is prone to *zorn* (see 3.2.1.4 above).

By comparison with Segradors and Keie — and, by implication, with Parzival — Gawain emerges as a model of courtesy and restraint. His approach is quite different, riding out 'sunder swert und âne sporn' (299,29) and achieving a peaceful solution where violence has failed.<sup>122</sup> Furthermore, Gawain's solicitous concern for Keie (298,8-11) contrasts with the latter's anger and sarcasm (298,12-299,12).

<sup>118</sup> Parzival has already been closely identified with Artus's best falcon (281,23-282,3).

<sup>119</sup> Hatto (trans.) 1980: 150 translates 'unbescheiden' as 'rash'. Whilst this is certainly apposite in the context, it seems to me that a lack of discernment is also implicit. The phrase 'Sus fuor der unbescheiden helt / zuo dem der minne was verselt' (287,5f.) seems to imply a meeting between two equally hopeless cases. Parzival himself is described as 'unversunnen' (287,9). In her commentary on *Wh.* 142,23, Decke-Cornill (1985: 164) glosses 'unbescheidenliche' (*Pz.* 760,30) as 'töricht, unverständlich'.

<sup>120</sup> Chrétien's Keu is presented in a less favourable light than Keie. It is his mockery of Sagremor that prompts Arthur to send him out to deal with Perceval, not his own spontaneous desire to defend the court's reputation (4274-88). When Gauvain later addresses Arthur (4340-69), it is to criticize the efforts of Sagremor and Keu and it is this that prompts Keu's anger (4370). Gauvain's response to Keu contains a measure of sarcasm (4404-12), thus the two are seen to respond to one another, rather than to be contrasting characters. There is no obvious parallel between Keu and Perceval.

<sup>121</sup> As he leaves Munsalvaesche, a voice calls out to Parzival 'ir sît ein gans' (247,27). The image of the goose wounded during its high flight (282,19) points to Parzival's eventual accession to the Grail kingship, despite the setback on his first visit.

<sup>122</sup> In *Le Conte du Graal*, Arthur insists that Gauvain should approach Perceval fully armed (4416f.). Furthermore, the blood drops are already fading away, so that Perceval is not as engrossed as he had been (4426-31). Thus Gauvain is easily able to engage Perceval in conversation without the need to cover up the blood drops and his achievement is both less remarkable and less differentiated from the efforts of Sagremor and Keu.

Finally, whereas Parzival reacts angrily to Cundrie's attack on him, directing his anger not only at her but also at God (see above), Gawan remains calm, even after Kingrimursel has accused him of treacherously killing his lord and kinsman.<sup>123</sup> This is the attitude that will characterize Gawan throughout *Parzival*, as will be seen.

### 3.3.2 Book VII

Wolfram has made significant changes to this episode by comparison with *Le Conte du Graal*, transforming a tournament into a full-scale war (Zimmermann 1974: 4-9). In line with this, anger plays a much more prominent role in this episode in *Parzival* than it does in the French text. In the latter, the only person specifically afflicted with anger is the elder sister at Tintagel, the counterpart of Obie (5011 and 5041).<sup>124</sup>

Gawan is initially a passive observer as the armies of Meljanz and his supporters gather outside the walls of Bearosche, watching the action much as the audience/reader might imagine it (339,21; 340,18; 341,3; 341,11f.). By questioning a passing squire, however, Gawan obtains a detailed explanation of events (343,19-349,16). Gawan's role is now that of careful listener, absorbing details of the background to the conflict. Just as he initially reflected on his best course of action on first catching sight of the army, he now reflects on what to do next. The narrator's rhetorical question is significant: 'waz welt ir daz Gâwân nu tuo, / ern besehe waz disiu mære sîn?' (349,28f.). The question both implies a commonality of interest between Gawan and the reader/audience and points to the correct answer: a further period of observation and analysis is required, and indeed this is exactly what happens (350,24; 350,27f.; 352,5).

Wolfram draws attention to the *zwîvel* that afflicts Gawan (349,30; 350,30), but without any apparent moral condemnation.<sup>125</sup> Gawan is in a very real dilemma and arguments could be constructed both for and against his intervention in the conflict. Having observed the location of the castle and the nature of the camp surrounding it, Gawan once again becomes a listener (352,11; 354,1f.; 358,15f.). Thus, by the time Gawan is offered hospitality by Scherules, he has obtained a very full picture of the

<sup>123</sup> Note that Cundrie's brief reference to Schastel Marveile (318,13-24) does not identify its special significance for Gawan and does not, therefore, provoke any response from him. For the dispute between Kingrimursel and Gawan, see 3.3.3 below.

<sup>124</sup> In *Le Conte du Graal*, the quarrel between the two sisters is nevertheless considerably more violent than in *Parzival*: the elder sister hits the younger one with such force that the imprint of her fingers can clearly be seen (5048f.). See Kleiber 1978: 380 for *Perceval* 5011 as an example of *ire-colère*.

situation, making use of at least two of his five senses, in accordance with the advice that Gurnemanz gave Parzival (171,22-24).<sup>126</sup> It is the exercise of discernment shackled to prowess on the field that enables Gawan to rise above the situation and resolve it. *Zorn*, on the other hand, militates against discernment and is seen as a destructive force, spreading out remorselessly from its original root in the quarrel between Obie and Meljanz.<sup>127</sup>

Meljanz is introduced by the squire interrogated by Gawan. He is fourth to be named after Poydiconjunz, Astor and Meljahkanz:

grôz her nâch iu dâ fûeret  
den sîn unfuoge rüeret,  
der künece Meljanz von Lîz.  
hôchvartlîchen zornes vlîz  
hât er gevrumet âne nôt:  
unrehtiu minne im daz gebôt. (344,13-18)

Meljanz's anger is aroused by Obie's refusal to reward his service with her love:

'ungern ich,' sprach er 'frouwe,  
iuch sô bî liebe schouwe  
daz iwer zürnen ûf mich gêt.  
genâde doch bîm dienste stêt,  
swer triwe rehte mezzen wil. (346,19-23)

He interprets Obie's reaction as *zürnen*, a sign of hostility, and reacts with *zorn*, just as Parzival had earlier reacted to God's failure to reward his service (332,1-8). Meljanz's suspicions, and thus his *zorn*, also fall on Lyppaut (346,27-30). The *knappe* remarks on the regrettable nature of Meljanz's anger:

mit zorne schiet er von der magt.  
sîn zürnen sêre wart geklagt  
von al der massenîe:  
in klagt ouch Obîe. (347,15-18)

Clearly, Obie regrets her actions.<sup>128</sup> As for Lyppaut, 'dem tet der zorn ûf freuden mat' (347,30). As the squire brings the tale to an end, he emphasizes again that the state of affairs being witnessed by Gawan has its roots in anger:

Sus hât der zorn sich für genomn,  
daz bêde künege wellent komn

<sup>125</sup> The phrase 'der zwîvel was sîns herzen hovel' (350,30) may point back to the opening lines of the poem: 'Ist zwîvel herzen nâchgebûr, / daz muoz der sêle werden sûr' (1,1f.), but the anguish suffered by Gawan is strictly of an earthly nature.

<sup>126</sup> Parzival is upbraided by Trevrizent for failure in this respect: 'dô dir got fünf sinne lêch, / die hânt ir rât dir vor bespart' (488,26f.).

<sup>127</sup> It is pertinent to note that *minne* also militates against reason, as the narrator later points out (365,8-10). Thus Meljanz and Obie are in something of a double bind: both love and anger obscure their critical faculties. The power of love to subvert reason is graphically demonstrated by Gawan's behaviour in Book VIII (see below). For the connection between love and anger, see 1.6.4 above.

<sup>128</sup> For the way in which anger leads to words and actions that are later regretted, see Thomasin's comments (1.6.2 and 3.2.1.3 above).



für Bêârosche ...' (349,1-3)

Despite his innocence (347,22), Lyppaut finds himself in a situation where he is damned if he takes up arms against his lord, and damned if he doesn't (354,30-355,19).<sup>129</sup> Just as the natural relationship between the lovers Obie and Meljanz is distorted by anger, so the natural relationship between vassal and lord is similarly distorted. As Lyppaut says, fealty would be more appropriate than enmity between them: 'ez hulfe mich und stüende ouch baz / sîn hulde dan sîn grôzer haz' (355,3f.). Since Meljanz 'sîn zürnen niht erlât / eren well mich hie besitzen' (355,18f.), Lyppaut is constrained to follow the advice of his men. The latter envisage a swift victory over Meljanz's young and inexperienced men: 'dâ erwerbe wir vil lîhte ein pfant, / dâ von ie grôzer zorn verswant' (356,5f.). This will then force Meljanz to 'al sîn zürnen mâzen' (356,10).<sup>130</sup> In this context, therefore, *zorn* represents the physical manifestation of enmity in the field and Meljanz's *zürnen* is his animosity towards Lyppaut, Obie and the occupants of Bearosche in general, prompted by Obie's rejection of his suit.

Although *minne* is identified as the root of Meljanz's anger (344,18), his anger is also linked to *unfuoge* and to *hôchvart* and may be explained in part by his youth, since he is referred to as 'der junge künece' (345,28).<sup>131</sup> The squire contrasts Meljanz with his battle-hardened uncle, Poydiconjunz, referring to the former as 'der junge' and the latter as 'der alde' (348,29), both given to *hôchvart* (348,28) and *unfuoge* (348,30). Later, the narrator twice mentions the fact that Meljanz leads an army of youngsters (356,3; 357,11), who are easy prey for the inners. Poydiconjunz takes exception to Astor's involvement in the *vesperie* (359,1-14), prompting Astor to respond 'durch got nu senftet iweren zorn' (359,27). Astor's argument is that his intervention averted Meljanz's ignominious defeat and that the outers then had the better of the fight. Poydiconjunz appears to accept this argument, since we are told 'Poydiconjunzes zorn was ganz / ûf sînen neven Meljanz' (360,1f.). However, his anger is ineffective and begins to look like exasperation, a reaction to his compromised authority. Poydiconjunz does not have

<sup>129</sup> For the legal niceties of the situation between vassal and lord in these circumstances, see Zimmermann 1974: 73.

<sup>130</sup> The army of Poydiconjunz, particularly the contingent of captured Bretons led by Astor, is acknowledged to present a greater threat (356,13-20).

<sup>131</sup> Nellmann (1994, II: 629, on 344,18) points out that the squire's evaluation of the relationship as *unrehtiu minne* is corrected later by the narrator (365,1-15). Zimmermann (1974: 65f.) draws attention to the significance of *unfuoge* and *hôchvart*. For the connection between youth and anger, see 1.2.3 above.

the excuse of youth and, as an elder statesman, must surely take some blame for allowing himself to be drawn into the hostilities.<sup>132</sup>

Obie herself is ‘vor zorne niht diu vrîe’ (353,24). Her pique with Meljanz leads her to accuse Gawan of being a merchant, which in turn leads to a quarrel with her sister Obilot. Obie makes three attempts to have Gawan classified as a merchant and thus remove him as a threat to Meljanz. Her antagonism towards Gawan and his total blamelessness are made abundantly clear:

diu bôt ir hazzes genuoc  
Gâwân, dern âne schulde truoc:  
si wolt im werben schande. (360,7-9)

Her first attempt fails when Gawan sees off the *garzûn* whom she sends to buy his horses and wares. It is one of the rare occasions on which Gawan resorts to a display of anger, as the *garzûn* is received ‘mit zorn’ (360,18).<sup>133</sup> It seems that a glance is all that is required in order to convey Gawan’s anger: ‘Gâwâns ougen blicke / in lîrten herzen schricke’ (360,19f.).<sup>134</sup> The threat of a good beating is then sufficient to put the *garzûn* to flight (360,25-29). Gawan’s anger thus reaffirms his knightly dignity and maintains the social order, dismissing the lowly *garzûn* in peremptory fashion.<sup>135</sup> In the circumstances, this anger seems entirely righteous. Obie’s subsequent attempts to incite first Scherules and then Lyppaut to treat Gawan as a merchant fail precisely because both men immediately recognize Gawan’s nobility (361,21-362,5; 364,26-30). Indeed, Scherules informs Lyppaut that he would defend Gawan against ‘al die gein im in zorne sint’ (364,6), even if they were close relatives.<sup>136</sup>

Ironically, when he first hears of the supposed merchant, Lyppaut announces: ‘ich sol diz guot gewinnen / mit zorne od abe mit minnen’ (363,9f.), presenting *zorn* and *minne* as alternative strategies to achieve his aims. *Zorn* here amounts to threatening behaviour, whilst *minne* represents the gentle art of persuasion. However, once Gawan’s knightly status is apparent, the man is far more valuable to Lyppaut than his

<sup>132</sup> His actions contrast unfavourably with those of Brandelidelin, uncle of Gramoflanz, in Book XIV.

<sup>133</sup> In *Le Conte du Graal*, the squire is already foraging for weapons and is approached by one of the court ladies, not the elder sister. Gauvain is full of ‘grant honte et grant anui’ (5094) on account of the things that have been said about him, but he is actually quite civil to the squire, whose behaviour is provocative, striking one of the horses and insulting Gauvain (5140-53). The squire disappears because ‘ne ne fu tex que puis osast / parler de rien qui li grevast’ (5155f.), therefore it is the squire’s lack of nerve rather than Gauvain’s presence that defuses the situation.

<sup>134</sup> For anger in the eyes, see 1.2.1.

<sup>135</sup> For anger as the prerogative of the male nobility, see 1.7.

<sup>136</sup> The definition of those who ‘gein im in zorne sint’ is ‘swer im dar über tuot gewalt’ (364,4), a clear pointer to the connection between *zorn* and violence (see 1.2.2 above).

possessions, but no amount of persuasion will induce Gawan to fight for the inners. It takes Obilot's offer of *minne*, in the sense of love (369,29f.), to spur him into action.<sup>137</sup>

The failure of Obie's attempts to impugn Gawan's honour now elicits sympathy from the narrator, and the audience/reader is also urged to take a sympathetic view. The power of love is stressed (365,1-10), but *zorn* has nevertheless taken hold over both Meljanz and Obie:

Obîe unt Meljanz,  
ir zweier minne was sô ganz  
und stuont mit solhen triuwen,  
sîn zorn iuch solde riuwen,  
daz er mit zorne von ir reit:  
des gab ir trûren solhez leit  
daz ir kiusche wart gein zorne balt.  
unschuldec Gâwân des enkalt,  
und ander diez mit ir dâ liten.  
si kom dicke ûz frouwenlîchen siten:  
sus flaht ir kiusche sich in zorn. (365,11-21)

This anger is strong enough to overwhelm *minne* and strong enough to overwhelm *kiusche* and feminine decorum.<sup>138</sup> Again, the narrator stresses the way in which *zorn* affects Gawan and other innocent victims, to the extent that 'swelch wert man dâ den lîp verlôs, / Obîen zorn unsanfte er kôs' (386,15f.). In this context, therefore, *zorn* is an unequivocally destructive force. Nevertheless, the narrator insists that Obie should not be held to blame: 'Von minn noch zornes vil geschiht: / nune wîzetz Obîen niht' (366,1f.).<sup>139</sup> The suggestion seems to be that love frequently gives rise to quarrels and the power of love is such that this cannot be avoided.<sup>140</sup>

After Gawan's victory over Meljanz, Obilot teases her sister 'diu disen schimpf mit zorn enpfien' (391,2). Obie's continuing anger now undoubtedly reflects her wounded pride, since she had previously been convinced of Meljanz's superiority to Gawan (358,1-3; 365,24-30). Meanwhile, Gawan's objective is to effect a complete reconciliation: 'hie wirt ein suone getân, / die niemen scheidet wan der tât' (392,18f.). Scherules then encourages Meljanz to abandon his anger towards Lyppaut:

swes friunt dâ bêdenthallen jehn,  
des sult ir gerne volgen,  
und sît im niht erbolgen. (393,10-12)

<sup>137</sup> For more detail on the nature of Gawan's *minne* relationship with Obilot, see Zimmermann 1974: 200-15.

<sup>138</sup> For the undesirable effects of *zorn*, see Thomasin's comments (*DWG* 667-86) at 1.6.2.

<sup>139</sup> Neither Zimmermann 1974 nor Nellmann 1994 have anything to say about 366,1.

<sup>140</sup> For the connection between love and anger, see 1.6.4 above.

This is broadly in line with the advice found in *Der deutsche Cato* to follow the majority when deciding what to do (see 1.6.1, 3.2.1.1 and 3.2.1.3 above). Meljanz is fairly easily persuaded to be reconciled with Lyppaut and he is willing to demonstrate this publicly by kissing Lyppaut's wife and Obilot, but he draws the line at kissing Obie: 'der dritten ich niht suone gihe' (395,14).<sup>141</sup> The *zorn* between the two lovers thus persists. Nevertheless, Obilot is equal to the task of reconciling them. When she has Meljanz transfer his homage to Obie, it is a satisfactory outcome for all concerned — so much so, that the narrator comments 'got ûz ir jungen munde sprach' (396,19). It is as if, with the abandonment of anger, divine order is restored.<sup>142</sup>

*Zorn* thus plays a very significant part in Book VII, pitching the two lovers, Obie and Meljanz, against one another. This, in turn, leads to hostility between the two sisters, Obie and Obilot, and between lord and vassal, Meljanz and Lyppaut. Furthermore, we witness *zorn* directed by Obie towards Gawan and by Poydiconjanz towards Meljanz. Within the turmoil created by all this *zorn*, Gawan functions as a still point. Unruffled by the aspersions cast on his social status, he charts a path through the hostilities and is ultimately able to act as peacemaker in a conflict in which Parzival is actively engaged on behalf of the aggressor.

### 3.3.3 Book VIII

The action in Book VIII is triggered by events in Book VI, when Gawan is challenged to judicial combat by Kingrimursel, and should be viewed in the context of the normal etiquette that accompanied formal enmity (*inimicitia*) between individuals in the Middle Ages. According to Bartlett (1998: 5), manifest enmity between individuals constituted acceptable grounds for wounding or killing, but it was essential that the enmity be made public, and a lapse of forty days before hostilities commenced in earnest was common in France and Germany.

In *Le Conte du Graal*, Gauvain is accused of slaying Guigambresil's lord without making any enmity public (4759-61) — a clear breach of etiquette — and the truth or otherwise of the accusation is never established. In *Parzival*, Gawan is accused of treacherously killing Kingrisin, an action that would naturally lead to a state of enmity

<sup>141</sup> For the kiss as a formal act of reconciliation, see Peil 1975: 206-08.

<sup>142</sup> The importance of *suone* as a theme for Wolfram may be gauged from the fact that, in *Le Conte du Graal*, this episode ends with Méliant still lying on the battlefield and no formal reconciliation between any of the parties involved.

between Gawan and Kingrisin's relatives.<sup>143</sup> Hence it is significant that, unlike Guigambresil, Kingrimursel is not only the dead man's vassal, but also his relative (324,11f.). However, it is also the case that Gawan is innocent (413,13-19). Thus Wolfram presents the episode at Schanpfunzun as another case of Gawan defending his innocence.<sup>144</sup>

It is *haz*, rather than *zorn*, which characterizes Kingrimursel's relationship to Gawan.<sup>145</sup>

ich wil bî sîme hazze sîn:  
swaz hazzes er geleisten mac,  
mîn haz im biutet hazzes slac. (320,28-30)

I would suggest that *haz* here represents manifest enmity, as defined by Bartlett (1998: 5). Thus the emphasis is 'not on the subjective feelings of the parties or on sporadic violence, but on an objective and public relationship' (Bartlett 1998: 12). Consequently, anger, as an emotion, has little part to play in the dealings between Gawan and the family and friends of Kingrisin. Gawan's calm reaction contrasts sharply with that of his brother Beacurs, who springs instantly to his feet and exclaims 'sîn velschen mich unsanfte regt' (323,6).<sup>146</sup>

In *Le Conte du Graal*, the legal flavour of the episode can be gleaned from Guigambresil's speech (4759-65) and Gauvain's reply (4775-87) (Busby 1980: 92; Le Rider 1978: 219-25; Bloch 1977: 37, fn. 67). There is no initial mystery as to the identity of Guigambresil and it is evident that he knows Arthur (4755). In *Parzival*, Kingrimursel cannot be recognized (320,9) until he has named himself and departed (325,3f.), and both Artus and Gawan have to be pointed out to him (320,15). The lack of recognition is undoubtedly connected to the manner of Kingrimursel's appearance, for Wolfram depicts him entering with his helmet fixed (320,10) and his sheathed sword in his hand (320,12f.), a gesture symbolizing that his visit involves the execution of justice

<sup>143</sup> Kingrimursel's analogy between Gawan's action and Judas's kiss underlines the seriousness of the accusation (321,11f.). Nellmann (1994, II: 620, on 321,10) points out that the greeting is a sign of peace, thus making Gawan's alleged action all the more insidious.

<sup>144</sup> 'unschuldec was hêr Gâwân' (413,13) is a repeated line (see also 363,17). Gawan's innocence of this particular charge is reaffirmed later (503,16-18).

<sup>145</sup> Beacurs's offer to represent Gawan is rejected by Kingrimursel precisely because 'ine trage gein im decheinen haz' (324,10).

<sup>146</sup> The situation is broadly similar in *Le Conte du Graal*, where Agravain also springs to his feet (4768f.) and there are repeated references to the mortal enmity between Gauvain and the people of Escavalon (5750; 6076f.; 6098f.). Peil (1975: 224) mentions springing to one's feet as a gesture associated with anger only in *Perceval*, but does not cite Agravain as an example.

(Hatto 1980: 167, fn.; Nellmann 1994, II: 620). The effect of Wolfram's alteration is to emphasize the legal framework within which Kingrimursel's challenge takes place.

Wolfram's conception of the Ascalun episode is quite different from Chrétien's and this is underlined by the almost complete lack of any direct reference to anger. In fact, the sole relevant reference here occurs when Vergulaht asks to be excused from accompanying Gawan into Schanpfanzen and Gawan indicates his assent saying 'daz ist och âne mînen zorn / mit guotem willen gar verkorn' (402,17f.).<sup>147</sup> Ordinarily, the prepositional phrase *âne zorn* carries the rather diluted sense of 'willingly' (see 1.1.1 above). Whilst this sense is certainly appropriate here, the point is somewhat laboured. Vergulaht's offer to abandon his trip if it offends Gawan (402,12f.) is without precedent in *Le Conte du Graal*, as is Gawan's reply (402,15-18), and it is tempting to see here an attempt by Wolfram to underline Gawan's courtliness and patient disposition at the outset.

In *Parzival*, it is Gawan, and he alone, who is threatened: the knight who bursts in and recognizes Gawan does not give vent to a long tirade against the princess, as in *Le Conte du Graal* (5840-65), but keeps his complaint against Gawan short and sweet (407,16-19). Antikonie's response is also quite different. She does not faint or express any fear, as in the French text (5869-77) but immediately suggests the best means of defence and hopes the situation will improve (407,26-30). She is upset, but in a rather different way:

Antikonien riuwe  
wart ze Schanpfanzen erzeiget  
unt ir hôher muot geneiget.  
in strît si sêre weinde:  
wol si daz bescheinde,  
daz friwentlich liebe ist stæte. (409,16-21)

Thus Antikonie is portrayed in an altogether more positive light than her French counterpart (see also 413,2 and 413,8f.). Her behaviour contrasts with that of her brother, rather than that of Gawan, for in Wolfram's version Vergulaht is all too ready to support the townspeople's attack, to the apparent embarrassment of the narrator (410,13-19). In *Parzival*, it is Kingrimursel's arrival and intervention, rather than the king's, which puts a stop to the attack. Kingrimursel's initial reaction is highly demonstrative:

der lantgrâve Kyngrimursel  
gram durch swarten unt durch vel,  
durch Gâwâns nôt sîn hende er want. (411,7-9)

It is not certain whether Kingrimursel is moved by anger, distress or both.<sup>148</sup> Nevertheless, his actions have a clear purpose: they express his opposition to the attack. This is then reinforced by his joining Gawan in the tower, causing the townspeople's resolve to falter (411,26-29).

The absence of anger in Wolfram's version of events is subtly underlined by the inter- and intratextual references introduced by Liddamus (419,11-13; 420,20-30; 421,20-28), a character not found in *Le Conte du Graal*.<sup>149</sup> The characters named by Liddamus represent two different responses to potential conflict, and the outcome of events in Book VIII seems to show non-violence prevailing. Liddamus apparently aligns himself with the opponents of violence, casting Kingrimursel in the role of angry aggressor, yet the situation is not as straightforward as it might seem. The same Liddamus originally espoused the idea of Vergulaht slaying Gawan on the spot (417,1-8), whilst Kingrimursel first suggested postponing his fight with Gawan (418,9-22).<sup>150</sup> Neither of these proposals offers any real prospect of an end to violence, since both are aimed at ensuring Gawan's death.<sup>151</sup> That Gawan's death would not be unavenged can be deduced from the reaction of Artus to Kingrimursel's original challenge:

hêre, erst mîner swester suon:  
wær Gâwân tât, ich wolde tuon  
den kampf, ê sîn gebeine  
læge triwenlôs unreine. (322,15-18)

Even the solution finally proposed by Liddamus, that Gawan should seek the Grail in Vergulaht's place, is put forward with a view to Gawan's death: 'Er hât hie'rliten grôze nôt / und muoz nu kêren in den tât' (426,1f.). Gawan is not saved from death by any of the protagonists, nor by his own efforts: events are simply so constructed that he

<sup>147</sup> The narratorial aside on the fate of 'd'ungetriuwen' (404,13) — 'des muoz ir sêle liden zorn' (404,16) — is discussed at 3.5 below.

<sup>148</sup> For the significance of tearing one's hair, see 1.2.1.

<sup>149</sup> Draesner (1993: 325) points out that the two groups of characters mentioned by Liddamus — Turnus, Wolfhart and Segradors on the one hand and Drances, Rumolt and Sibeche on the other — represent two different ways of life, the former always spoiling for a fight and the latter inclining against combat. For details of Segradors, see above. Wolfhart is associated with *zorn* in the *Nibelungenlied* (2260,1; 2271,3) and is also compared to a lion (2272,1; 2273,3), an animal often associated with anger (see 1.2.5.2).

<sup>150</sup> If it were not for Kingrimursel's formal challenge and offer of safe conduct, Liddamus's first suggestion might have some support in law; see Bartlett 1998: 16, fn. 2, quoting from the Charter of St Omer of 1164: 'Nullus autem militum aut optimatum seu burgensium potest conducere in villam eum contra quem aliquis de communione habet querelam.'

escapes. Ultimately, the judicial combat is abandoned on the grounds that Vergulaht and Gawan are related, and that Gawan is innocent anyway (503,5-20). The models cited by Liddamus thus prove to be unreliable, exploited by Liddamus and Kingrimursel in turn to their own ends and ultimately of no significance for the outcome of Book VIII.<sup>152</sup> Epic anger and its remedies are an irrelevance in this episode.<sup>153</sup>

### 3.3.4 Books X-XIV

There are two aspects to Gawan's adventures after Ascalun: his visit to Schastel marveile, involving the release of his female relatives from Clinschor's spell, and his courtship of Orgeluse. Although both strands of the narrative are interwoven, it is convenient to consider first *zorn* associated with characters and episodes at Schastel marveile, then *zorn* associated with Orgeluse.

#### 3.3.4.1 Plippalinot and Bene

When Gawan awakes to find Bene at his bedside, she immediately puts herself at his disposal: 'hêrre, gebietet über mich: / swaz ir gebiet, daz leist ich' (554,17f.).<sup>154</sup> Although he has been sleeping under her coat (553,22f.) and the narrator hints at the possibility of a sexual relationship (554,3-6), Gawan is only interested in asking Bene about the ladies in the castle. However, his persistent questioning leads her to burst into tears (555,14-16), thus setting the stage for a misunderstanding when Plippalinot enters the room. Although he suspects that his daughter has been raped, Plippalinot nevertheless does not appear to take it amiss.<sup>155</sup>

der liezez âne zürnen gar,  
ob diu maget wol gevar  
ihts dâ wære betwungen,  
und ob dâ was gerungen:  
dem gebârt se gelîche,  
diu maget zûhte rîche,  
wand si dem bette nâhe saz.

<sup>151</sup> Kingrimursel reiterates that it will be a fight to the death: 'mich muoz hêr Gâwân slahen tôt, / odr ich gelêre in râche nôt' (421,11f.).

<sup>152</sup> Draesner (1993: 312) points to the focus on the narratorial art in Book VIII and concludes (334) that intertextual material is here used by Wolfram to marginalize the heroic epic.

<sup>153</sup> For the role of anger in traditional epic see 1.4 and 1.7.3 (*furor heroicus*).

<sup>154</sup> Bene is actually repeating her father's command to her (550,21). Christoph (1981: 207-12) explores the possibly different motivation of father and daughter for adopting a 'laissez faire' attitude to Gawan. However, Dallapiazza's explanation (1996: 88) of the scene as an example of 'sexual hospitality' seems more convincing. He also traces Wolfram's deliberate use of ambiguity throughout this episode.

<sup>155</sup> The fact that she is weeping and making a display of 'grôze klage' (555,16) would tend to support the impression that she has been raped. Compare the demeanour of Imane (125,6-16) and of the unnamed female envoy raped by Urjans (525,11-528,30) (see 3.3.4.4 below).



daz liez ir vater âne haz. (555,19-26)<sup>156</sup>

Although Plippalinot's lack of anger at this point seems peculiar to the modern reader (Nellmann 1994, II: 718), it is explicable in terms of the medieval custom of 'sexual hospitality' (Dallapiazza 1996: 88).<sup>157</sup> Of more interest is his attempt to console Bene:

dô sprach er 'tohter, wein et niht.  
swaz in schimpfe alsus geschiht,  
ob daz von êrste bringet zorn,  
der ist schier dâ nâch verkorn.' (555,27-30)

This has the flavour of proverbial wisdom and represents an attempt to make light of the suspected rape, which is reduced to the level of something that might happen 'in schimpfe', i.e. in jest. Any resultant *zorn* is trivialized, thus indicating that Plippalinot, as Bene's legal guardian, has no intention of pursuing the matter legally.<sup>158</sup>

It is notable that Gawan feels constrained to rebut Plippalinot's suggestion immediately — 'hiest niht geschehn, / wan des wir vor iu wellen jehn' (556,1f.), apparently regarding it as something of a slight on his honour. Once again, Gawan finds himself defending his innocence in a potentially embarrassing and dangerous situation, although on this occasion there are no serious consequences.<sup>159</sup>

Later in the text, Bene herself has cause to be angry. It emerges that she enjoys the confidence of both Itonje and Gramoflanz. We are told that she is aware of Itonje's love for Gramoflanz (631,17-20), and she is subsequently to be seen with Gramoflanz, sitting 'unders küneges armen' (686,1). At this point, Bene is relaxed about Gramoflanz's forthcoming fight with Gawan, unaware of the fact that the new lord of Schastel marveile is none other than Gawan, who is also Itonje's brother (686,2-10).

When she finds Gawan in a weakened state after fighting Parzival, Bene is deeply distressed and initially curses the hand that has wounded him (691,30-692,18).

<sup>156</sup> 'der liezez âne zürnen gar' (555,19) simply means that Plippalinot was untroubled by what had happened. As with *zorn* in the phrase *âne zorn lân*, *zürnen* here is formulaic and has a somewhat diluted sense (see 1.1.1 above).

<sup>157</sup> For an alternative view, see Bartsch/Marti II (1929): 235.

<sup>158</sup> Contrast the situation when Urjans rapes the unnamed female messenger, who is actively encouraged to lay a formal complaint before Artus (see 3.3.4.4 below).

<sup>159</sup> This incident contrasts sharply with events at Schanpfanzun, where Gawan's welcome advances towards Antikonie are rudely interrupted by a grey-haired man who directly accuses Gawan of rape (405,1-407,19), leading to a full-scale assault by the townsfolk on Gawan, from which he is saved only by the arrival of Kingrimursel (407,20-412,30). Bene's approaching the sleeping Gawan also reverses Parzival's encounter with the sleeping Jeschute: in both cases, rape is wrongly suspected by the woman's male guardian, but the reactions of Orilus and Plippalinot could not be more different. It is undoubtedly significant that both Antikonie (a princess) and Jeschute (a duchess and daughter of a king) enjoy higher social status than the lowly ferryman's daughter.

Ironically, however, it is Parzival who opens her eyes to the true situation, revealing Gawan's identity (693,7) and Gramoflanz's hostility to Gawan with the words 'welt ir zürnen gein im kêrn, / daz sol ich iu mit swerten wern' (693,11f.). Now Bene herself is overcome with anger, cursing Gramoflanz as an 'ungetriwer hunt' (693,22).<sup>160</sup> The latter immediately realizes the strength of Bene's anger — 'Dô des zornes vil geschach' (694,1) — and takes her on one side, entreating her 'frouwe, zürne niht' (694,3). However, he proceeds to make matters worse by revealing Gawan's relationship to Itonje (694,6), making Bene even more unhappy (694,9-18).

Bene's anger is a rare example of justified female anger. There are several reasons why Gawan should command greater loyalty from her than Gramoflanz. To begin with, Gawan has been extremely generous to her father, as the latter has already impressed on her (549,1-6). Secondly, as inhabitants of Schastel marveile, both Bene and Itonje owe fealty to Gawan as their new lord (659,11-14). Finally, Gramoflanz's hostility to Gawan is incompatible with his love for Itonje. Loyalty to Gawan thus requires Bene to be hostile to Gramoflanz as a matter of course, but Gramoflanz's behaviour provides moral justification — 'unreht er Gâwân doch tuot' (686,28).<sup>161</sup>

### 3.3.4.2 Lit marveile

The Lit marveile ordeal can be interpreted on at least three different levels, all with some relevance to the theme of *zorn*. On one level, a number of features characterize it as a diabolical ordeal which requires Gawan to withstand everything that the forces of evil can throw at him, including *zorn*. On another level, it is a test of Gawan's *fortitudo*, but one which demands not only prowess in battle but also endurance (*patientia*). In this context, the *zorn* that he encounters represents the hostility and *furor heroicus* of his opponents. Finally, it is a test of *minne*, in which the trials and tribulations that Gawan must suffer and the *zorn* of his adversaries give physical form to the hostility that he experiences from Orgeluse, all of which must be overcome in order to win her love.

Throughout Gawan's Lit marveile ordeal, *zorn* is explicitly linked only with the brawny rustic and the lion. The brawny rustic is described in more detail than his

<sup>160</sup> For cursing (insulting and/or threatening speech) as a symptom of anger, see 1.2.2 above. For the pejorative use of the word 'dog', see 1.2.5.3.

<sup>161</sup> See 1.6.2 and 1.7 above for occasions when anger may be justified: specifically, the idea espoused in *Der deutsche Cato* that one should 'dem bösen wis erbolgen' (382) and Gregory the Great's notion of anger directed at the sins of others.

French counterpart (569,30-570,6),<sup>162</sup> and has some of the attributes of a giant, since he is *stark*<sup>163</sup> and carries a club.<sup>164</sup> It is therefore unsurprising that he addresses Gawan ‘zornlîchen’ (570,16).<sup>165</sup>

Like the rustic, the lion also shares some characteristics with giants. It, too, is *stark* (571,12; 571,19), and ‘als ein ors sô hôch’ (571,13) and ‘grôz’ (571,19). Furthermore, it persists in its attack (572,5-17), even after one leg has been severed (571,29).<sup>166</sup> Lions are traditionally associated with anger (see 1.2.5.2 above) and this specimen does not disappoint, attacking initially ‘mit zorne’ (571,21) and continuing to spring at Gawan ‘mit zorne’ (572,16) in spite of its injuries.<sup>167</sup> Its anger is extinguished only in death:

Gâwân tet im einen stich  
durch die brust unz an die hant,  
dâ von des lewen zorn verswant:  
wander strûchte nider tôt. (572,18-21)

Both lions and anger can have diabolical associations, and references to the lion’s roaring (571,1) and hunger (571,18) are reminiscent of the biblical injunction to beware the Devil:<sup>168</sup>

sobrii estote vigilate  
quia adversarius vester diabolus  
tamquam leo rugiens circuit  
quaerens quem devoret  
cui resistite fortes fide (I Peter 5.8f.)

The fact that both the rustic and the lion are described as *freislîch* (570,1; 571,18) seems to emphasize the demonic connection.<sup>169</sup> However, the pairing of a confrontation with a giant and a confrontation with a lion is not uncommon in medieval literature, and is found, for instance, in Ulrich von Zatzikhoven’s *Lanzelet* (1918-78). This combination is also found in the Bible, where David kills a lion and a bear that have snatched a ram from the midst of the flock as a precursor to his defeat of Goliath (I Samuel 17.34-37). Similarly, Benaiah kills the two sons of Ariel, described as ‘duos leones’, a huge

<sup>162</sup> Compare *Perceval* 7851f.

<sup>163</sup> In *Willehalm*, Wolfram often uses this adjective to describe the heathens and Rennewart. Schmidt (1979: 156, on *Wh.* 415,3) quotes Poag’s interpretation of this epithet as ‘Andeutung einer übersteigerten Kraft’, which seems appropriate here.

<sup>164</sup> ‘Waffe der Riesen und Wilden’ (Nellmann 1994, II: 722; Martin 1976: 413 on 570,5). See also McDonald 1988: 40-02 and Habiger-Tuczay 1999: 654.

<sup>165</sup> For the connection between giants and anger, see 1.7 above.

<sup>166</sup> This is typical of the giant in combat with the medieval hero (Habiger-Tuczay 1999: 654f.).

<sup>167</sup> Chrétien’s lion is also angry, attacking Gauvain ‘par grant fierté et par grant ire’ (7857) — see Kleiber 1978: 298 and 305.

<sup>168</sup> For the connection between the Devil and anger, see 1.5.2.3 above. Chrétien’s lion is ‘toz fameilleus’ (7853), but there is no reference to it roaring.

<sup>169</sup> Note that Malcreatiure is also *freislîche getân* (521,6) and that Parzival associates *freisen* with the Devil (120,21).

Egyptian, five cubits tall and armed with a spear 'like a weaver's beam', and a lion (see 1.2.5.2 above). The Benaiah incident is of particular interest, not only because of similarities between the large Egyptian and the brawny rustic, but also because it was interpreted as symbolic of Christ's victory over the Devil (see 1.2.5.2 above).

A further indication of diabolical overtones is the fact that the *Lit marveille* episode is consistently characterized by loud noise.<sup>170</sup> As in *Le Conte du Graal* (7822-24), the whole castle resounds with the noise of the bed (567,18), but Wolfram gives this more emphasis and adds a military flavour:

sus reit er manegen poynder grôz.  
swaz der doner ie gedôz,  
unt al die pusûnære,  
op der êrste wære  
bî dem jungesten dinne  
und bliesen nâch gewinne,  
ezn dorft niht mêr dâ krachen. (567,19-25)<sup>171</sup>

This is then followed by the loud roaring that precedes the lion's appearance 'als der wol zweinzec trummen / slüege hie ze tanze' (571,2f.) and the snorting that accompanies the lion's attack (572,6f.).<sup>172</sup>

A connection between anger, loud noise and the Devil is established at an early stage in *Parzival* when the 'schal von huofslegen' (120,15) causes the young Parzival to exclaim: 'wan wolt et nu der tiuvel komn / mit grimme zorneclîche' (120,18f.).<sup>173</sup> Demonic associations may also be indicated by the fact that Wolfram, unlike Chrétien, specifically associates automata with the bed.<sup>174</sup> The hail of missiles directed at Gawan and the appearance of the rustic are further pointers in this direction.<sup>175</sup> The brawny

<sup>170</sup> The acoustic aspect of Gawan's ordeal is in sharp contrast to the visual aspect of Parzival's first visit to the Grail Castle. With regard to the latter, Green (1982: 108, fn. 69) has noted: 'By comparison with this overwhelming visual impression an acoustic dimension is brought in only by the narrator asking for attention from his listeners.'

<sup>171</sup> Compare 378,10f. and 379,11-15. See also Gahmuret's entry into the town at Kanvoleis (63,2-9). This sort of battle imagery is often associated with *minne*.

<sup>172</sup> Chrétien's account of the lion's attack contains no reference to noise whatsoever.

<sup>173</sup> Perceval also associates the noise of the approaching knights with the Devil (111-16).

<sup>174</sup> 'Als Machwerk Clinschors verkehrt sich der Automatismus des *Lit marveille* im negativen Sinne, so daß es als Exponent der bösen Kräfte, die in seinem Schloß herrschen, gelten kann' (Lerchner 1993: 477).

<sup>175</sup> Archers and arrows are often interpreted in this way. Kilström 1968 states that 'B[ogenschütze], die auf Menschen oder alleg. Figg. schießen, bedeuten im allgem. das Böse (Laster, Teufel), das den Gerechten zu verderben sucht'. Reference is also made to the illustrated MSS of Prudentius's *Psychomachia*, where archers are amongst the personified vices attacking *Patientia*. The invisibility of the archers would tend to increase the demonic aspect. Giants, with whom the rustic shares characteristics, may also represent the Devil (Psenner 1971). As to the rustic's angry demeanour, an interesting comparison may be made with Tristrant in the guise of fool, as described in MS B of Eilhart's *Tristrant*: 'der tore zürnen began / gleich einem tüffelichen man. / der kolben trug er vil hoch' (*Eil. Tr.* 8854).

rustic's accusation 'vons tiuvels kreften ir noch lebt' (570,20) suggests that only someone protected by the Devil could survive such an ordeal.

Finally, the Lit marveile ordeal was devised by Clinschor, who is given a name, background and motivation that are without precedent in *Le Conte du Graal*.<sup>176</sup> He has been described (McFarland 1993: 286f.) as a 'Lucifer-like figure', 'the principal personal embodiment of spiritual evil', and has power over the region between earth and heaven, the traditional sphere of demonic activity:

er hât ouch aller der gewalt,  
mal unde bêâ schent,  
die zwischen dem firmament  
wonent unt der erden zil;  
niht wan die got beschermen wil. (658,26-30)<sup>177</sup>

He would therefore appear to be a fitting originator for such a diabolical scheme. However, whilst all this detail would seem to place the Lit marveile ordeal and its inventor, Clinschor, firmly in the realm of the demonic, with anger as one of the manifestations of the demonic, this interpretation is not wholly satisfactory. Clinschor's association with *nigrômanzî* (617,12), *zouber* (66,4; 617,13; 657,7 29; 658,2), *list* (566,25; 589,17; 617,12; 637,19; 655,30; 658,2) and *wunder* (566,15; 590,1 and 5 and 16; 655,29; 656,6-8 and 16; 658,22) certainly gives weight to the idea of demonic associations.<sup>178</sup> However, unlike Lucifer, Clinschor seems bent on the perversion of natural order rather than the spiritual ruin of mankind (Bumke 1994). Furthermore, Clinschor himself does not indulge in acts of physical aggression. Indeed, he concludes pacts with Irot (658,14) and Orgeluse (617,17), sets Gramoflanz a 'peaceful precedent' (605,29f., Hatto (trans.) 1980: 304)<sup>179</sup> and offers peace to whoever survives the Lit marveile ordeal (659,6-9). This is very reasonable behaviour, the opposite of what one

<sup>176</sup> The first, unnamed reference to Clinschor as 'ein phaffe der wol zouber las' (66,4) is assumed to derive from a misunderstanding of Chrétien's reference to 'I. clers sages d'astrenomie, / Que la roïne i amena' (7548f.), transforming an attendant into an abductor (Nellmann 1994, II: 491f. on 66,4f.).

<sup>177</sup> Martin (1976: 452) suggests that 'mal unde bêâ schent' refers to both humans and spirits, however, following Nellmann (1994, II: 742 on 658,27) and Bartsch/Marti (III (1932): 32), it seems more probable that it refers to evil and good spirits. For the air as 'the traditional sphere of demonic activity', see Tiller 1993. For more general information on demons, see Minear 1993.

<sup>178</sup> I include references to the pillar which Clinschor stole from Secundille (589,1-590,16; 592,1-20). Although this was constructed originally by Jeometras, it is nevertheless an important constituent part of the enchantments at the castle.

<sup>179</sup> The interpretation of 605,29f. is not unproblematic (Hagenlocher 1992: 54). However, Hagenlocher may be overhasty in rejecting the notion that Clinschor could function as a role model. Gramoflanz evidently never attempted the Lit marveile ordeal and seems here to be fudging the issue.

might expect, and underlines the fact that the Lit marveile ordeal is not simply a diabolical test for Gawan.<sup>180</sup>

The ordeal's function as a test of *fortitudo* and *patientia* in *Parzival* emerges from a close comparison with *Le Conte du Graal*. It is from Plippalinot that Gawan finds out about Lit marveile. From the outset, the ferryman makes it clear a most perilous challenge awaits Gawan here: 'dâ ist nôt ob aller nôt' (556,16). It is a challenge that has never been attempted (557,8f.) and that threatens death (557,10). The emphasis is on suffering and on the severity of the ordeal:

'aller kumber ist ein niht,  
wan dem ze lîden geschiht  
disiu âventiure:  
diu ist scharpf und ungehiure  
für wâr und âne liegen.  
hêrre, in kan niht triegen.' (557,25-30)<sup>181</sup>

Plippalinot lends Gawan his shield (557,4; 560,29) and we are told in advance that this shield will save Gawan's life (560,22). He also provides advice that will prove to be life-saving:

Gedenket, hêrre, ob ir sît wert,  
disen schilt unt iwer swert  
lâzet ninder von iu komn.  
so ir wænt daz ende habe genomn  
iwer kumber grœzlichen,  
alrêrst strîte ist er gelîch.' (562,1-6)

In *Le Conte du Graal*, by contrast, the ferryman willingly provides much more information about the castle and its inhabitants, but does not give Gauvain any specific advice as to how to withstand the ordeal, nor does he lend him a shield, or any other equipment. Although the Marvellous Bed is deadly (7749-51; 7801-08), there is more emphasis on the threat of death (albeit a particularly nasty death) than on the threat of suffering. The Marvellous Bed is a test of virtue, for no knight (*chevalier*) may enter:

Qui de covoitise soit plains  
Ne qui ait en lui nul mal vice

<sup>180</sup> Clinschor calls to mind a phrase from Shakespeare: 'The prince of darkness is a gentleman' (*King Lear*, Act 3, Scene 4). In the Faust legend, Mephistopheles is similarly gentlemanly — the concept of a gentlemanly, law-abiding adversary may ultimately derive from the Bible, where Satan enters into an agreement with God in the Book of Job.

<sup>181</sup> The last two lines appear at first sight to be redundant. Martin (1976: 407 on 557,30) comments simply 'öfters bei unangenehmen Nachrichten' and cites parallels from *Kudrun* and the *Rolandslied*. However, a closer parallel lies in Trevrizent's words: 'ich enbinz niht der dâ triegen kan' (476,24). Trevrizent provides Parzival with information and spiritual guidance that is ultimately essential to his success in achieving the Grail kingship, whereas Plippalinot provides Gawan with crucial information and practical advice about Schastel Marveile. Note that both advisors have hung up their spurs: Trevrizent swore to give up knighthood after Anfortas was injured (480,11-15), whilst Plippalinot tells Gawan 'ich strîte selten' (561,1), and his shield is completely undamaged (560,30).

De losenge ne d'avarisse.  
 Coars ne traîtres n'i dure,  
 Ne foimentie ne parjure:  
 Cil i muerent si a delivre  
 Qu'il n'i püent durer ne vivre. (7556-62)

Put another way, the ocean will freeze over before a suitable knight can be found (7590-92), because to remain on the bed he must be 'Sage et large, sanz covoitise, / Bel et hardi, franc et loial, / Sanz vilonie et sanz tot mal' (7594-96).<sup>182</sup> Wolfram's bed is thus a test of endurance — *patientia* — where Chrétien's is a test of moral character.<sup>183</sup>

It is in keeping with this different conception of the ordeal that Chrétien's bed is easily approached (7818-20), whilst Gawain must leap onto the moving bed (567,1-3), despite having to walk on the slippery floor (566,27-29) encumbered by his host's heavy shield (567,4-6). When Gauvain sits down, there is a terrific din and he is immediately assailed by arrows and slingstones fired by unseen hands (7821-43) but he himself does nothing. By contrast, Gawain is not only subjected to terrible noise but also to the violent movement of the bed (567,14-25). The combined effect of this is so terrifying that:

Gâwân muose wachen,  
 swier an dem bette læge.  
 wes der helt dô pflæge?  
 des galmes het in sô bevilt  
 daz er zucte über sich den schilt. (567,26-30)

The contrast between lying on the bed but deliberately staying awake emphasizes the strangeness of the situation (Freitag 1972: 122) and the narrator's rhetorical question points to the strangest aspect of all: there can be few sights more ridiculous than that of a knight cowering under his shield. Furthermore, Gawain adopts this position *before* he is pelted with pebbles and crossbow bolts. Once again, Gawain is in danger of looking like a fool, but there is method in his madness, for Gawain has put his faith in God:

Er lac, unde liez es walten  
 den der helfe hât behalten,  
 und den der helfe nie verdrôz,

<sup>182</sup> Busby (1993: 517) points out that there is a lot of MS variation in the catalogue of good qualities listed in these lines. This is not the place to consider whether there is any implied criticism of knighthood here.

<sup>183</sup> The term *patientia* derives from *pati*, meaning 'to suffer', and encompasses a range of meaning from 'endurance' and 'suffering' to the Christian virtue of 'patience'. *Patientia* is the opponent of *Ira* in Prudentius's *Psychomachia* (see 1.3.3 above) and patience is the traditional remedy for anger according to the 'Doctrine of Contraries' enshrined in early-medieval penitentials (see 1.3.2 above). The biblical exponent *par excellence* of *patientia* is Job. Gawain is not subjected to exactly the same trials as Job, but he enjoys high status at Arthur's Court (just as Job does before God) and he is continually subjected to ignominy. Clinschor fits perfectly into the role of Satan here.

swer in sînem kumber grôz  
 helfe an in versuochen kan.  
 der wîse herzehafte man,  
 swâ dem kumber wirt bekant,  
 der rûefet an die hôhsten hant:  
 wan diu treit helfe rîche  
 und hilft im helfeclîche.  
 daz selbe ouch Gâwân dâ geschach.  
 dem er ie sîns prîses jach,  
 sînen krefteclîchen gûeten,  
 den bat er sich behûeten. (568,1-14)<sup>184</sup>

This faith turns out to be well-placed, for the shield does indeed protect Gawan from the ensuing onslaught of pebbles (568,28f.), vindicating Plippalinot's advice. Furthermore, the advice about keeping his guard up also serves Gawan well, for he does not relax when the thunderous noise abates and the bed stops moving (568,15-19), nor when the hail of pebbles and bolts has stopped, despite his hopes that the ordeal might be over (569,24-27). In *Le Conte du Graal*, Gauvain, on the other hand, starts removing the arrows from his shield but is interrupted before he can complete this laborious task (7844-48).<sup>185</sup>

Having established Gawan's capacity for *patientia* on the bed, the ensuing confrontations with the brawny rustic and the lion provide an opportunity for Gawan to demonstrate his *fortitudo*. Walther von der Vogelweide plays on this traditional combination of lion-fight and giant-fight in a well-known strophe:

Wer sleht den lewen? wer sleht den risen?  
 wer überwindet jenen und disen?  
 daz tuot jener, der sich selber twinget  
 unt alliu sîniu lit in huote bringet  
 ûz der wilde in stæter zûhte habe.  
 geligeniu zuht und schame vor gesten  
 mugen ein wîle erglesten.  
 der schîn nimt drâte ûf und abe. (L. 81,7-14)

Walther's poem explicitly links *fortitudo* to inner strength and draws on a rich tradition of proverbial wisdom.<sup>186</sup> Wolfram also seems to lock into this tradition, but without losing sight of the physical achievement involved. The biblical lion fights of

<sup>184</sup> The concept of God's *helfe* is also important for Parzival (Nellmann 1994, II: 663 on 451,13).

<sup>185</sup> Gawan cuts the bolts from his shield with his sword after the brawny rustic has left but before the lion rushes in (570,26-30). This is a more rapid and practical response, in anticipation that the shield is about to see further action. It also means that his sword is already drawn.

<sup>186</sup> In his commentary on L. 81,7, Wilmanns (1924: 301) cites Proverbs 16.32: 'melior est patiens viro forti et qui dominatur animo suo expugnatore urbium', as well as Lactantius ('non enim fortior iudicandus est qui leonem quam qui violentiam et in se ipso inclusam feram superat iracundiam') and Sedulius Scotus ('Quamvis qui fulvum superat virtute leonem, rex teneat clarum laudis honore locum, sed plus est laudum fastus calcare superbos, iram seu rabidam mitificare feram [...] est magis imperium mentem frenare per artem'). Wolfram seems to have had Proverbs 16.32 on his mind — see also 3.2.4.1 and 3.4.



David, Samson and Benaiah all have the immediate function of demonstrating the hero's courage and Lit marveile also has this function (see 1.2.5.2 above). One of the many positive associations of lion symbolism is that of courage and this would seem to come to the fore at the very end of the ordeal as Gawan lies with his head on the lion (573,8).<sup>187</sup> Not only does Wolfram specifically compare Gawan to the lion at this juncture — 'si bêde dem tôde wârî gelîch, / der lewe unde Gâwân' (573,28f.), but he also describes them both running out of fizz in similar fashion. The lion 'strûchte nider tôt' (572,21) whilst we are told of Gawan 'durch swindeln er strûchens pflac' (573,7). It is at this level that the *zorn* of the rustic and the lion represent the *furor heroicus* of an opponent.<sup>188</sup>

The third aspect of the Lit marveile episode, that of *minne* ordeal, derives from Clinschor's role as the frustrated lover, a role that, at times, assumes comic dimensions.<sup>189</sup> He is a man who has become embittered by his castration at the hands of Ibert, who caught him *in flagrante delicto* with his wife Iblis.<sup>190</sup>

Durch die scham an sîme lîbe  
wart er man noch wîbe  
guotes willen nimmer mêr bereit;  
ich mein die tragent werdekeit.  
swaz er den freuden mac genemn,  
des kan von herzen in gezemn. (658,3-8)

Although 'der ist maneger diete worden sûr' (656,13) and the final mention of him is as the adversary of Arnive and the other women at Schastel marveile (784,19f.), Clinschor also has his good points: he is 'der wîse Clinschor' (589,11; 605,29; 656,1). Prior to his castration he enjoyed a high reputation:

er trat in prîs sô hôhen pfat,  
an prîse was er unbetrogen.

<sup>187</sup> Ohly (1995: 327) has described the lion as symbolic of Gawan's *Löwenmut*. Elsewhere (1958-59), he states: 'Welche Bedeutung das Ding jeweils hat, bestimmt sich nach der in Betracht gezogenen Eigenschaft des Dinges und nach dem Kontext, in dem das betreffende Wort erscheint. (...) Im konkreten Textfall kann der Löwe also nicht 'Gott oder Teufel' bedeuten, sondern nur eines und in einem anderen Textzusammenhang das andere.' However, Wolfram consistently exploits the polyvalency of images drawn from the natural world and the lion here is a case in point, functioning as a symbol of anger, passion, the demonic, and courage all at the same time.

<sup>188</sup> Again, as the adversary behind the scenes, Clinschor must have some noble qualities in order to qualify as a suitable opponent. Presumably Wolfram also wished to avoid creating the impression that Orgeluse and Gramoflanz had made a pact with the Devil.

<sup>189</sup> This is particularly true of Arnive's description of his castration: 'zeim kapûn mit eime snite / wart Clinschor gemachet' (657,8f.). The cruel humour is hammered home by the immediately following lines: 'des wart aldâ gelachet / von Gâwâne sêre' (657,10f.).

<sup>190</sup> It may also be significant that, in the Koran, Iblis is the name used to designate Satan in his/her rebellion against Allah ('Ali 1989: 25, fn. 52 to Surah 2.36; Martin 1976: 451). The name is otherwise known from Ulrich von Zatzikhoven's *Lanzelet*. See Nellmann (1994, II: 741 on 656,26f.) about this and other suggested origins for the name.

von Clinschor dem herzogen  
 sprâchen wîb unde man,  
 unz er schaden sus gewan. (656,20-24)

Even after arrival at Schastel Marveile, he is still 'hövesch unde wîs' and sufficiently concerned for his reputation to allow Orgeluse's knights to engage in combat on his land 'durch sînen prîs' (618,1f.). However, Clinschor is, in more ways than one, personally incapable of *manheit*.

The Lit marveile ordeal thus takes on a rather different complexion, operating also as an allegory of Clinschor's own misfortune. The perilous bed becomes a metaphor for the perils of love and the price of failure is impotence. Several aspects of the ordeal point towards this sort of interpretation. The bed itself is an appropriate location for the trials of love (Lerchner 1993: 474-81). Furthermore, Gawan seems particularly suited to this sort of trial.<sup>191</sup> We already know that he is something of a ladies' man and, at the point where he reaches Lit marveile, he is already in the grip of passionate love for Orgeluse. At the beginning of Book XII, the narrator indulges in a long apostrophe to Frou Minne, in which the susceptibility of Gawan and his whole extended family to the perils of love is expounded at length (583,5-587,14).

The hail of arrows and pebbles is also appropriate to the torments of love. The arrow or dart has been associated with love since classical times and Wolfram was certainly familiar with this imagery (532,1-6), referring to Cupid's 'strâle' (532,11) and 'des hêrn Amores gêr' (532,13). However, Gawan is pelted not only by 'pfile' (569,9 and 20; 570,28), but also by 'wazzersteine / sinewel unde hart' (568,28f.). Orgeluse, who is described as 'ein spansenwe des herzen' (508,30), uses similar imagery when speaking to Gawan about potential suitors:

maneger sîniu ougen bolt,  
 er möhts ûf einer slingen  
 ze senfterm wurfe bringen,  
 ob er sehen niht vermîdet  
 daz im sîn herze snîdet. (510,2-6)

She is also described by the grey-haired knight in the orchard as 'ein sunnenblicker schûr' (514,20), an image that seems to anticipate the hail of projectiles that will rain

<sup>191</sup> See 301,8: 'Gâwân was solher noete al wîs'.

down upon Gawan during the ordeal.<sup>192</sup> Indeed, this image is explicitly linked to the ordeal by the narrator during his apostrophe to Frou Minne:

ez solten minnære klagen,  
waz dem von Norwæge was,  
dô er der âventiure genas,  
daz in bestuont der minnen schûr  
âne helfe gar ze sûr. (587,10-14)<sup>193</sup>

The brawny rustic, as a kind of giant, may stand as a symbol of sexual excess.<sup>194</sup> He perhaps also recalls an incident in the *Straßburger Alexander*, where Alexander and his men come upon ‘einen grôzen man, / der was freislîchen getân’ (*Str. Alex.* 5365f.).<sup>195</sup> This ‘large man’ is the living proof that no sane man can withstand the charms of woman, running off into the forest with a woman placed in his path (*Str. Alex.* 5381-90) and crying out with a voice ‘harte grimme, / grôz unde freislîch, / eines lewen stimme gelîch’ (*Str. Alex.* 5398-400).

A final pointer to the erotic overtones of the Lit marveile ordeal comes right at the end, when Gawan collapses onto the dead lion:<sup>196</sup>

sîn wanküssen ungelîch  
was dem daz Gymêle  
von Monte Rybêle,  
diu sîeze und diu wîse,  
legete Kahenîse,  
dar ûffe er sînen prîs verslief. (573,14-19)

The reference is to the episode in Eilhart’s *Tristrant* (6708-810) in which Isalde apparently grants Kahenis a night of passion with Gymele, but actually provides the latter with a pillow to slip under Kahenis’s head. It is the very pillow that Isalde normally uses in order to get a good night’s sleep when separated from Tristrant and its effect is to cause Kahenis to sleep soundly all night, leaving Gymele unmolested.

<sup>192</sup> It is also an image with military associations: in his letter to Belakane, Gahmuret predicts that their son will be ‘an strîte ein schûr’ (56,3), whilst Parzival is described as ‘er schûr der rîterscheffe’ (678,22). Cundrie la surziere is ‘der freuden schûr’ (313,6), whilst Obilot undertakes to protect Gawan: ‘für ungelückes schûr ein dach / bin ich iu senfteclîch gemacht’ (371,7f.).

<sup>193</sup> Wolfram also preserves the identical rhyme: ‘wan diu ist bî der sîeze al sûr, / reht als ein sunnenblicker schûr’ (514,19f.).

<sup>194</sup> McDonald (1988: 142) comments: ‘Those endowed with the club are self-sufficient and fearless, tend to sexual intemperance, and are outcasts from society, whose standards of conduct they do not respect.’

<sup>195</sup> The physical similarity is not otherwise great, since this individual is further described as being covered with pig’s bristles (*Str. Alex.* 5368f.) and does not seem to be armed. However, the brawny rustic’s costly sealskin clothing (570,2) seems to derive from the Alexander legends (Wis 1984). There are, in fact, many points of contact between the Lit Marveile episode and the Alexander legends, but unfortunately space does not permit further analysis here.

<sup>196</sup> Draesner (1993: 354-57) notes that the reference to *Tristrant* calls to mind the *minne* connection in the absence of Orgeluse. She also points out that, by comparing Gawan to Kahenis, Wolfram subtly underlines the fact that Gawan’s role is subsidiary to that of Parzival, just as Kahenis’s role is subsidiary to that of Tristrant.

The implied contrast between Gawan and Kahenis works on more than one level. Wolfram's text points most obviously to the different outcome for the two men in terms of honour. Kahenis is tricked out of sexual intercourse just as his sister had been before him and is subsequently upset and angry: his honour is compromised and this prompts him to seek revenge on Tristrant later. Whilst Kahenis 'sînen prîs verslief', Gawan, on the other hand, is to be showered with honour for surviving the Lit marveile ordeal: 'der prîs gein disem manne lief' (573,20). However, it is also the case that Kahenis's passion for Gymele is destined to remain unconsummated, whilst Gawan will actually be successful in his pursuit of Orgeluse. Furthermore, Gawan's resistance to *zorn* contrasts with Kahenis succumbing to anger as soon as he is aware of the deceit.<sup>197</sup> Finally, Gawan's discomfiture is a direct result of knightly activity, albeit of an unusual kind, whereas Kahenis is a victim of lust, having done nothing to earn Gymele's favour.<sup>198</sup>

This final contrast between Gawan and Orgeluse on the one hand and Kahenis and Gymele on the other emphasizes the dangerous constellation of *zorn*, *minne* and knighthood that underpins both relationships. In the Lit marveile episode, Gawan proves himself to be a model of *patientia* and *fortitudo*, destined for success in the field of love and in the field of battle and able to deal with *zorn* appropriately. Thus he ignores the brawny rustic, reasoning 'dirre ist blôz' (570,10), but defends himself against the lion, which clearly presents a threat to life and limb (571,18-22; 572,5-10 and 16f.). Nevertheless, Gawan still ends the ordeal lying in a pool of blood: a situation open to misinterpretation and one that evidently makes him feel socially as well as physically uncomfortable (572,26; 576,22-26). This concern with personal honour and outward

---

<sup>197</sup> There are considerable variations in the description of Kahenis's reaction in the *Tristrant* MSS; see *Eil. Tr.* 6800f.: 'daß waß vor laid nauch ertoubet / Keheniß' (H) || 'he waß von zcorne na betoubit' (D) || 'vor laide waß vil nahe ertobt / Kaedein' (B); *Eil. Tr.* 6808f.: 'gar in grossem laide, / an lieb der wýgant' (H) || 'Keheniß waß rechte leide' (D) || 'da hette zorn mit laiden / Kaedein von der geschicht' (B). However, his feelings are made explicit later when he contradicts Tristrant in front of Perenis (*Eil. Tr.* 6918f.): 'sinen zorn er also draut / an im er rechen wolt' (H) || 'sinen zorn wolde he an im rechin drate' (D) || 'an dem zorn waß er stette, / zu hant erß rechen wolte' (B).

<sup>198</sup> Gymele had previously rejected Kahenis's advances, accusing him thus (*Eil. Tr.* 6684): 'ich main, daß ir ain pur sind' (H) || 'ich wene, ir ein gebür sit' (D) || 'ich wene, ir ain gepur seyt' (B). Subsequently, when Kahenis awakes from his slumber, he is (*Eil. Tr.* 6780) 'den toren' (H) || 'der rechte thore' (D) || 'da geleichet er ainem toren' (B). The contrast with Gawan and Orgeluse is extremely sharp: Orgeluse's insults and accusations are quite unjustified, whereas Gymele's are not.

appearance is Gawan's Achilles' heel and inhibits him in part from reaching a peaceful solution with Gramoflanz: that problem has to be resolved by others.<sup>199</sup>

### 3.3.4.3 Orgeluse

Orgeluse is a striking figure (Richey: 1957: 95-99; Gibbs 1972: 197-214; Wynn 1976-77) with a commanding presence in Books X-XIV of *Parzival* and one who is characterized throughout by *zorn*. This *zorn* falls into two types, which will be discussed separately: *zorn* directed at Gawan and *zorn* directed at Gramoflanz.

A close study reveals an extraordinary number of points of comparison and contrast between her character and that of some of the other main female figures in *Parzival*.<sup>200</sup> In fact, as will be seen, she emerges as a key female figure in the work, which is all the more surprising when one considers that her role, as bride-to-be of Gawan, is technically of secondary importance.<sup>201</sup>

Comparison between Wolfram's Orgeluse and her counterpart in *Le Conte du Graal*, L'Orgueilleuse de Logres, is complicated by the incomplete state of Chrétien's text. It is impossible to tell whether L'Orgueilleuse was intended to marry Gauvain, for Chrétien's text contains no clues, although it has been argued that no such role could have been envisaged for her (Wynn 1976-77). The narrator describes her as *estolte* (6870), *male* (7145; 8414; 8469), *ramprosnouse* (7179), *sanx merchi* (8373) and 'la damoisele [...] / Qui felon cuer avoit el ventre' (7269f.). The judgement of other characters is even harsher, giving her a diabolic quality (7456; 8599; 8604). She is of indeterminate social rank and is presented in an uncompromisingly bad light. No attempt is made to justify her behaviour or to win our sympathy for her and there is no effort to explain her particular attraction for Gauvain. In her manner, L'Orgueilleuse is deliberately provocative, as she later explains to Gauvain when describing the consequences of Guiromelant's killing of her previous lover:

Mais de mon premerain ami,  
Quant mors de lui me departi,

<sup>199</sup> Gawan is, of course, trapped by his love for Orgeluse, whose implacable anger towards Gramoflanz is only formally abandoned under protest (see below).

<sup>200</sup> Thus far, scholarship has tended to concentrate on comparison with Condwiramurs and with Obie — see Gibbs 1972: 197-214 and Zimmermann 1972.

<sup>201</sup> Wolfram never loses sight of Parzival as the main hero of the story. At the beginning of Book VII, we are reminded that Parzival is 'des mæres hêren' (338,7) and at the end of Book XIII, as Parzival is about to re-enter the action, we are told 'an den rehten stam diz mære ist komn' (678,30). Nevertheless, Zimmermann (1972: 135) has noted that Gawan's conversations with Orgeluse are eight times as long as Parzival's with Condwiramurs and that, in the poem as a whole, only Trevrizent's conversations with Parzival are longer.

Ai si longuement esté fole  
 Et de si estolte parole  
 Et si vilaine et si musarde  
 C'onques ne me prenoie garde  
 Cui j'alaisse contraiant,  
 Ains le faisoie a esciant,  
 Por che que trover en volsisse  
 .I. si ireus que jel fesisse  
 A moi irier et correcier  
 Por moi trestote depechier,  
 Que piech'a volsisse estre ocise. (8947-59)<sup>202</sup>

Far from being an angry woman, L'Orgueilleuse is *fole*, *vilaine* and *musarde*. She seeks to provoke anger in others and her insulting behaviour is entirely governed by this principle. It is therefore no surprise that her behaviour is never characterized as anger.

### 3.3.4.3.1 Orgeluse and Gawan

Wolfram's Orgeluse is the Duchess of Logres<sup>203</sup> and her initial behaviour towards Gawan is consistently characterized by *zorn*. On his return with her palfrey, Gawan is met with abuse, to which he responds: 'ist iu nu zornes gâch, / dâ hœrt iedoch genâde nâch' (515,17f.). The narrator speaks of 'swaz si hât gein Gâwân / in ir zorne missetân' (516,11f.) and describes her riding up to Gawan 'mit alsô zornlîchen siten' (516,18) and subsequently speaking to Gawan 'mit zorne' (535,30).

When Gawan first sets eyes on Orgeluse, the initial impression is of a stunningly beautiful and sexually attractive woman without any negative connotations (508,21-30). By commenting that Orgeluse is outshone only by Condwiramurs (508,22f.), the narrator points to the secondary position of Orgeluse, mirroring the relationship of Gawan to Parzival and thus indicating her suitability as a partner for Gawan. However, as 'ein reizel minnen gir' (508,28), she retains something of the siren-like quality of L'Orgueilleuse.<sup>204</sup> The epithets applied to Orgeluse are generally complimentary, but prior to the *Li gweiz prelljus* episode they are often followed by an adverb or adverbial phrase that qualifies her actions negatively, thus 'Orgelûs diu rîche / fuor ungeselleclîche' (516,15f.); 'Orgelûs diu rîche / sprach hôchverteclîche' (535,11f.); 'diu rîche und wol geborne / sprach wider ûz mit zorne' (535,29f.); 'sprach Orgelûs diu clâre / Gâwâne aber ze vâre' (598,17f.). In this way, Wolfram carefully contrasts her innate nobility and goodness with her manner. A similar effect is achieved by the irony of

<sup>202</sup> See Kleiber 1978: 328 and 337 for 8954-59 as an example of *ire-colère*.

<sup>203</sup> See 591,19; 593,30f.; 619,26; 630,7; 630,16; 632,15; 653,18; 670,25; 672,26.

having her most cutting comments issue from her 'süezer munt' (509,12; 515,12; 523,5).<sup>205</sup>

However, it is also noticeable that Orgeluse laughs at Gawan continuously to begin with (521,15; 523,2; 531,9). This behaviour to some extent mirrors that of L'Orgueilleuse, who laughs at Gauvain after Greoreas has ridden off on his horse (7145), declares herself happy to follow him (7181f.) and joyfully reports the approach of Greoreas's nephew (7295). Yet Wolfram's insistence on laughter may be significant, since it creates an enormous contrast between Gawan and Parzival. Whereas Cunneware laughs at Parzival and thereby identifies a country bumpkin as the knight who will achieve the highest distinction (151,13-15), Orgeluse laughs at the man whom we know to be 'der werde erkande Gâwân' (338,4) and makes him out to be a fool.<sup>206</sup> Despite her status as a princess (which is stressed), Cunneware is subjected to the anger of Keie (151,21-152,22), whilst Orgeluse, a duchess, metes out anger to the son of a king. Parzival is consciously motivated to avenge the wrong done to Cunneware and achieves great deeds of prowess in the process. Gawan, on the other hand, is consciously motivated by desire for Orgeluse but inadvertently becomes her potential avenger and similarly achieves great deeds.<sup>207</sup> However, whilst Parzival's discomfiture of Keie is appropriate and final, Gawan's proposed encounter with Gramoflanz is fraught with other considerations, principally its effect on Itonje, and would create further problems if Gawan were to triumph.<sup>208</sup>

An important factor in the way in which Orgeluse pokes fun at Gawan is the continuing theme of impugned knightly identity, which is picked up from Book VII,

---

<sup>204</sup> Just as the tall knight warns Gauvain that fetching the palfrey of L'Orgueilleuse has cost many knights their head (6806-09), so Gawan is warned by the old knight that Orgeluse has been the death of many a knight (514,6-8).

<sup>205</sup> This casts an interesting light on the final reconciliation between Orgeluse and Gramoflanz, where we are told: 'ir süezer munt rôl gevar / den künech durch suone kuste' (729,18f.). It would appear that there is still a contrast between outward appearance and inner feeling. This seems to be confirmed by the fact that she is close to tears, thinking of Cidegast's death (729,20-24), and is foreshadowed by the earlier comment 'ir zorn was *nâch* verdecket' (723,7 — my emphasis).

<sup>206</sup> Orgeluse taunts Gawan with *tumpheit*, the quality which characterized Parzival's early exploits; see 512,16; 515,13-15; 530,10. Note also the comparison of Gawan to a goose (515,13; 599,2): this too links him to Parzival, who is called a goose on leaving the Grail Castle (247,27) and who may be identified with both the falcon and the wounded goose at the Plimizoel (281,23-282,22). For a more detailed analysis of Gawan's *tumpheit*, see Haas 1964: 38-47.

<sup>207</sup> Zimmermann (1972: 140-44) has shown the extent to which Gawan's exploits at Schastel marveille are interlinked with his wooing of Orgeluse.

<sup>208</sup> It might be added that Parzival's encounter with Keie could have gone awry if the seneschal had been killed. We are left in no doubt that, for all his vitriol, Keie is nevertheless a valued member of the Arthurian court (298,4f.).

where Gawan is accused by Obie of being a merchant. The mockery begins when Gawan stops to pick a herb, which he intends to use to heal Urjans:

si sprach 'kan der geselle mîn  
arzet unde rîter sîn,  
Er mac sich harte wol bejagn,  
gelernt er bûhsen veile tragn.' (516,29-517,2)

Thus Orgeluse implies that Gawan would make a better living from a medical career than a knightly one. This jibe is developed further after Gawan has lost Gringuljete to Urjans:

für einen rîter ich iuch sach:  
dar nâch in kurzen stunden  
wurdt ir arzet für die wunden:  
nu müezet ir ein garzûn wesn. (523,6-9)

The insults become ever more serious, as Orgeluse demotes Gawan from knight to doctor and then to *garzûn*. Eventually, like Obie, Orgeluse taunts Gawan with the suggestion that he looks like a merchant:

si sprach 'füert ir krâmgewant  
in mîme lande veile?  
wer gap mir ze teile  
einen arzet unde eins krâmes pflege?  
hüet iuch vor zolle ûfem wege:  
eteslich mîn zolnære  
iuch sol machen fröuden lære.' (531,12-18)

Both medical and mercantile imagery recur within Books X-XIV: the former in connection with *minne*, the latter in connection with combat.<sup>209</sup> Gawan's career thus illustrates the way in which *minne* and *strît* are interlinked. However, by taunting Gawan in this way, Orgeluse is particularly linked to Obie, with whom she shares a predisposition to *zorn* (Zimmermann 1972: 134). Furthermore, both women are defended by Wolfram (see 3.3.2 above). Of Orgeluse, the narrator says:

swer nu des wil volgen mir,  
der mîde valsche rede gein ir.  
niemen sich verspreche,  
ern wizze ê waz er reche,  
unz er gewinne küende  
wiez umb ir herze stüende.  
ich kunde ouch wol gerechen dar

<sup>209</sup> There is an ironic element to both types of imagery. On the one hand, Gawan displays medical skill in his dealings with Urjans, but on a metaphorical level he is in need of a doctor within the sphere of love. There are numerous uses of medical metaphors associated with *minne*, viz. 593,14-18; 599,15-20. Similarly, mercantile imagery is often to be found in the sphere of combat and knightly achievement, viz. 537,20; 538,6; 604,2. Gawan is, in fact, 'taxed' by Plippalinot for his victory over Lischöys: 'den zins von dem plâne / den iesch er zühtecliche' (544,20f.). Finally, by surviving the ordeal at Schastel marveile, Gawan becomes the rightful owner of the *krâmgewant* (623,25-28) which was a love-gift from Anfortas to Orgeluse. The medical and mercantile imagery is entirely absent from the conversations between L'Orgueilleuse and Gauvain.



gein der frouwen wol gevar:  
 swaz si hât gein Gâwân  
 in ir zorne missetân,  
 ode daz si noch getuot gein im,  
 die räche ich alle von ir nim. (516,3-14)

Whilst neither woman is to be blamed, the reasons for this are rather different. In Obie's case, the narrator embarks on a digression about the power of love and its hold over Obie and Meljanz (365,1-366,2). The two young lovers are excused on the grounds of love's overwhelming power, which still holds sway at the time of writing. Elsewhere, frequent references to the youth of Meljanz and his followers may also imply that age is a mitigating factor (see 3.3.2 above). Orgeluse, on the other hand, is a more mature character and, whilst *minne* plays its part, no sweeping generalization is made to excuse her actions. Her anger stems from a very particular set of circumstances that are unique to her and is particularly closely linked to the wounding of Anfortas as the final straw.

Obie's anger is ultimately more easily assuaged than that of Orgeluse. Although she is still angered when Obilot flaunts the tattered sleeve that had been her token to Gawan (390,27-391,2), in the thrall of love she is quickly reconciled to Meljanz once Obilot obliges Meljanz to accept her (396,10-397,2). Orgeluse, on the other hand, harbours bitter thoughts about Gramoflanz to the very end (see 3.3.4.3.2 below), but is reconciled to him in deference to Gawan and Artus (727,29-728,8; 729,15-24).<sup>210</sup> Just as Obie turns out to be true to Meljanz and marries him, so Orgeluse eventually proves to be worthy of Gawan and becomes his loving wife. Both women are elevated socially: the daughter of Duke Lyppaut marries the King of Lis, just as the Duchess of Logroys marries the son of the King of Norway.

It transpires that Orgeluse is not set on provoking anger in those she meets, but rather on finding a suitable knight to take revenge on Gramoflanz for the death of her husband, Cidegast. Her harsh words to Gawan were spoken 'durch ein versuochen' (614,7), and the object of the love-service she solicited was the death of Gramoflanz (616,11f.). In this context, she received the love-service of Anfortas, which resulted in his dreadful wound (616,14-617,2). Orgeluse thereby becomes central to the story of

<sup>210</sup> Compare Orgeluse's kiss with that of Itonje: 'Orgelûsen ich gekûsset hân, diu sînen tût sus werben kan. / daz was ein kus den Jûdas truoc' (634,17-19). She goes on to state that she can never truly be reconciled to Gramoflanz's enemies, although she has kissed them (again, in deference to Gawan). The reference to Judas is interesting, in so far as he is traditionally associated with anger (see 1.5.2.2 above). The differences, however, are obvious. Itonje is concerned about something which might happen, but is in fact avoided. Orgeluse is angry about things which have actually happened and cannot be changed. This also applies to Orgeluse's reaction to kissing Parzival (696,8-14).

*Parzival*, for she is at least partly responsible for the state of affairs at the Grail Castle.<sup>211</sup>

Orgeluse's treatment of Gawan is reminiscent of Erec's treatment of Enite (see 2.1.2 above), which was also 'durch versuochen getân' (*Erec* 6781). Just as Erec satisfies himself as to Enite's worth 'als man daz golt sol / liutern in der esse' (*Erec* 6785f.), so Orgeluse says to Gawan:

dem golde ich iuch geliche,  
daz man liutert in der gluot:  
als ist geliutert iwer muot. (614,12-14)

The surprising aspect of this is that, in *Erec*, this type of *zorn* is very much associated with masculinity: it underscores Erec's position as protector, guardian and master of his wife. In *Parzival*, Orgeluse's *zorn* towards Gawan is symbolic of her power and influence over him at the courtship stage. His powerlessness is made explicit when he catches sight of Orgeluse from the wondrous pillar, as the narrator remarks 'gein minne helfelôs ein man, / ôwê daz ist hêr Gâwân' (593,19f.). The end of Orgeluse's *zorn* towards Gawan is signalled by her prostration at his feet (611,23), an unmistakeable gesture of humility. From this point onwards, she will defer to Gawan, as can be seen from her abandonment of *zorn* towards Gramoflanz (see 3.3.4.3.2 below).

Another duchess in *Parzival* finds herself in quite the opposite position to Orgeluse, namely Jeschute.<sup>212</sup> Whereas Orgeluse subjects Gawan to *zorn*, Jeschute is subject to her husband's *zorn* (see 3.2.1.2 above). Her memory is evoked when Malcreatiure appears on a rather sickly horse and we are told 'frou Jeschût diu werde / iedoch ein bezzer pfärt reit' (520,10f.). This is the very horse which Gawan is forced to ride after Urjans has ridden off on Gringuljete. Whilst Jeschute is unjustly punished for Parzival's *tumpheit*, Gawan is unjustly made to appear *tump*. Whereas Jeschute originally took Parzival for a *garzûn* (132,6), Orgeluse now taunts Gawan with being just that (523,9). Both Jeschute and Gawan are innocent victims who suffer the consequences of *zorn*, and both suffer it with equanimity.

<sup>211</sup> Anfortas himself does not escape criticism for serving Orgeluse (472,29f.; 478,30-479,2).

<sup>212</sup> The fact that Wolfram makes Jeschute Erec's sister (134,6) may suggest that 'Wolfram recognized the similarity to the harsh treatment of Erec's wife, and was then prompted to extend this thematic association to a tie of kinship (as it were ironically) between the harshly treated Jeschute and Erec, the husband who treated his own wife harshly' (Yeandle 1984: 361).

However, the appearance of Malcreatiure also has other functions. On one level, it provides a link between Orgeluse and his sister Cundrie la surziere.<sup>213</sup> As the servant of Orgeluse, it is appropriate that Malcreatiure shares her angry disposition. We are told: ‘der wûrze unt der sterne mâc / huop gein Gâwân grôzen bâc’ (520,3f.), and he addresses Gawan ‘mit zorne’ (520,16). Furthermore, his physical appearance is suggestive of anger: short, spiky hair — ‘kurz, scharf als igels hût’ (517,27) and ‘igelmæzec’ (521,12) — is one of the characteristics of *Ira* (see 1.3.3 above), and the hedgehog itself is also sometimes associated with anger (see 1.2.5.6 above).<sup>214</sup>

Cundrie too is associated with anger (see 3.2.3.2 and 3.2.4.4 above). Just as Parzival is spurred on by Cundrie to leave the court and pursue the Grail singlemindedly, so Gawan is spurred on by desire for Orgeluse.<sup>215</sup> Both women create a false impression initially. Cundrie’s physical appearance is deceptive for, as she says to Parzival: ‘ich dunke iuch ungehiure, / und bin gehiurer doch dann ir’ (315,24f.).<sup>216</sup> Similarly, Orgeluse cannot be judged by her behaviour (516,5-8). Both Cundrie and Orgeluse end up actively seeking forgiveness for their past words in similar fashion.<sup>217</sup> In both cases, the change of heart is quite unexpected, but whereas Cundrie seeks Parzival’s forgiveness in public, Orgeluse seeks Gawan’s forgiveness in private. However, both use the same gesture, throwing themselves at the feet of the man in question (611,23; 779,22f.) and both weep (602,18; 612,22; 779,24). Cundrie’s re-appearance paves the way for Parzival to return to the Grail Castle and finally release Anfortas from his suffering, whilst Orgeluse’s change of heart releases Gawan from suffering and marks a gradual

<sup>213</sup> In *Le Conte du Graal*, there is no suggestion that the unpleasant squire who approaches as Gauvain attends to Greoreas is in any way connected with L’Orgueilleuse or related to the Hideous Damsel.

<sup>214</sup> This angry appearance may have been suggested by *Le Conte du Graal*, where the unnamed, unpleasant-looking squire apparently has red, tousled hair that stands on end, but there is an enormous amount of MSS variation in the further description of the squire’s hair at l. 6990 (Busby 1993: 297 and 511). Busby opts for ‘come pors espis correciez’ (like an angry porcupine), but ‘pors qui est hericiez’, ‘pors sanglers’, ‘pors hericiez’, ‘pors qui est coroucez’, ‘pors qui est correciez’ and ‘pors quant est courouciez’ are all attested. ‘Hericiez’ might account for ‘igelmæzec’. Both the colour and the dishevelled state of the squire’s hair point to an angry disposition — see 1.2.4.1.1 for the connection between red hair and anger and 1.2.5.6 for the connection between porcupines and anger.

<sup>215</sup> Again, Zimmermann (1972: 140-44) has shown the extent to which Orgeluse and Schastel Marveile are interlinked.

<sup>216</sup> Note that Malcreatiure makes an identical impression on Gawan: ‘dô dûht ern ungehiure’ (517,15). Nellmann (1994, II: 619) on 315,24f. (citing Bumke 1991: 81) states: ‘Die traditionelle Vorstellung »daß Häßlichkeit innere Deformation anzeigt und Schönheit innere Vollkommenheit«, ist hier in Frage gestellt.’ However, in Orgeluse’s case, it is not appearance but manner that is deceptive.

<sup>217</sup> Orgeluse: ‘nu sult ir des geruochen / daz ir zorn verlieset / unt gar ûf mich verkieset’ (614,8-10); Cundrie: ‘si warp al weinde umb sînen gruoz, / so daz er zorn gein ir verlûr / und âne kus ûf si verkûr’ (779,24-26).

softening of her attitude that eventually enables Artus to effect a reconciliation between her and Gramoflanz:

Gâwân mîner swester suon  
ist wol sô gewaldec ir,  
daz si beidiu im unde mir  
durch ir zuht die schulde gît. (727,10-13)

On a second level, Gawan's encounter with Malcreatiure is reminiscent of his earlier encounter with the *garzûn* sent by Obie to enquire whether his horses were for sale (360,10-29). It is another of the rare examples of Gawan's anger. Whilst the term *garzûn* automatically implies lower social status and, indeed, the *garzûn* takes fright at the merest angry glance from Gawan (see 3.3.2 above), Malcreatiure is a *knappe*, which does not preclude noble status, and is variously described as *fier* (517,17), *clâr* (519,23), *kurtoys* (519,30), and *wîs unde wert* (521,10). Malcreatiure is evidently underwhelmed by Gawan's physical presence (520,15-26), such that Gawan is moved to threaten him with a response 'daz ir wol meget für zürnen hân' (521,5), before throwing him to the ground. Orgeluse is amused by this turn of events, stating 'vil gerne ich schouwe / iuch zwêne sus mit zornes site' (521,16f.). Nevertheless, Gawan's anger does have the effect of inducing fear in Malcreatiure (521,10f.), once again restoring social order.

#### 3.3.4.3.2 Orgeluse and Gramoflanz

Orgeluse has lost her husband Cidegast to a violent death. In this, she resembles a number of other female figures in *Parzival*.<sup>218</sup> However, she has also suffered further disappointment, in so far as Anfortas, whom she selected to replace Cidegast and to act as her avenger, has been seriously wounded:

der künec in mîme dienst erwarp  
dâ von mîn freude gar verdarp.  
dô ich in minne solte wern,  
dô muos ich niwes jâmers gern.  
in mîme dienste erwarb er sêr.  
glîchen jâmer oder mêr,  
als Cidegast geben kunde,  
gab mir Anfortases wunde.  
nu jeht, wie solt ich armez wîp,  
sît ich hân getriwen lîp,  
alsolher nôt bî sinne sîn?  
etswenn sich krenket ouch der mîn,  
Sît daz er lît sô helfelôs,  
den ich nâch Cidegaste erkôs  
zergetzen unt durch rechen. (616,19-617,3)

<sup>218</sup> For example, Belakane (Isenhart), Herzeloyde (Gahmuret), Sigune (Schionatulander), Annore (Galoës).

Orgeluse is not specific about Anfortas's wound, but we know from Trevrizent's conversation with Parzival that he is wounded in the genitals (479,12). Thus, at the very moment when she is ready to enter into a sexual relationship with Anfortas, he is rendered incapable. His wound rules him out as husband, lover or avenger. This is presented as being at least as bad, if not worse, than the loss of Cidegast and is also Orgeluse's own explanation for her behaviour. Her angry behaviour is thus motivated by a 'desire of retaliation' for the double loss of Cidegast and Anfortas.<sup>219</sup> It is this which causes her to carry on weeping uncontrollably (615,22) even after Gawan has promised to teach Gramoflanz a lesson (614,19-25).<sup>220</sup> This promise is evidently insufficient, as she exclaims 'waz ob mir an iu helfe kûmt, / diu mich richet unt ergetzet' (616,8f.) and goes on to explain that all her efforts to find an avenger have been aimed at securing Gramoflanz's death (616,11f.). Anfortas had been specifically chosen 'zergetzen unt durch rechen' (617,3). Furthermore, Gramoflanz was destined to die if he attempted the Lit marveile adventure (617,29f.). It seems that nothing less than Gramoflanz's death will satisfy the duchess, although Gawan never specifically undertakes to kill his adversary.

Gramoflanz describes to Gawan Orgeluse's *zorn*: 'si kan noch zornes walden / gein mir' (606,4f.). In spite of his offer of marriage, which would have elevated her to the rank of queen, 'dâ kêrt si gegen ir herzen vâ'r' (606,11). Even after she has surrendered to Gawan, Orgeluse's hostility persists, and Artus has to reassure Gramoflanz that if he comes with only a few attendants he will be guaranteed 'vride für den selben zorn / von der herzoginne wol geboren' (720,13f.), and so it comes to pass:

ir zorn was nâch verdecket:  
wan si het erwecket  
von Gâwân etslîch umbevanc:  
dâ von ir zürnen was sô kranc. (723,7-10)

Orgeluse is unique amongst the female characters in *Parzival* in going on the offensive to seek revenge: in this respect, she has rightly been compared to Kriemhild in the *Nibelungenlied*, albeit she does not actually lift a weapon herself, nor turn on her

<sup>219</sup> Orgeluse herself makes no comment about Gramoflanz's subsequent behaviour. According to Gramoflanz himself, he abducted Orgeluse and offered her queenship (i.e. marriage, 606,9) but was unable to win her over in a year of wooing (606,12f.). Unlike Hartmann's Laudine, Orgeluse is not attracted by the prospect of wedding her husband's killer. Holding her as a virtual prisoner for a year cannot have endeared Gramoflanz to Orgeluse, but nothing is made of this.

<sup>220</sup> It is also notable that Orgeluse only stops weeping when Gawan, despite his joy at her change of heart, laments with her and specifically asks the reason for her tears (615,21-26). This is another example of Gawan's use of questions to good effect (in marked contrast to Parzival).

own family. Her *zorn* towards Gramoflanz, like her *zorn* towards Gawan, has a masculine quality. By engaging a male champion, Orgeluse is able to give vent to her anger in a way normally reserved for men.

Her willingness and ability to assume male responsibilities for vengeance and justice are illustrated also by her spontaneous decision to deal with Urjans, whom she considers to have been insufficiently punished (529,2-23) (see Nellmann 1994, II: 712 on 529,7f., 529,15f. and 529,20f.). When Gawan explains to Orgeluse the background to Urjans's actions, saying 'Frowe, daz ist sîn räche ûf mich' (529,1), she immediately responds 'sich twirhet sîn gerich' (529,2). She intends to make up for Artus's failure — 'sît ez der kûnec dort niht rach' (529,7) — and makes the reversal of gender roles explicit, declaring herself to be 'iwer bêder vogt' (529,10), thus assuming the role of *vogt*, the normal legal term for a woman's male guardian. Her final words on the subject of Urjans underline her intention to deal with him in a masculine way: 'man sol unfuoge rechen / mit slahen unt mit stechen' (529,15f.). This may be taken as evidence of her power within Logres (Kellermann-Haaf 1986: 63-65).

In this respect, Orgeluses's behaviour may be contrasted with that of Sigune. Schionatulander is killed before he and Sigune can consummate their love (141,20f.), but she nevertheless regards him as her husband (440,8). In contrast to Hartmann's leading lady, Laudine, we are told 'Sigûne gerte ergetzens niht' (253,15). Orgeluse, on the other hand, chose Anfortas 'zergetzen unt durch rechen' (617,3). It is notable that the term *ergetzen* often occurs in contexts where it is associated with revenge or making amends for some sort of wrong that has been suffered.<sup>221</sup> Sigune and Orgeluse therefore represent diametrically opposite responses to sudden bereavement: the former's sorrow and withdrawal from the world contrasting with the latter's *zorn* and active engagement with her enemies.

### 3.3.4.3.3 Orgeluse and Parzival

Before the arrival of Gawan on the scene, Orgeluse offered herself and her territory to Parzival (619,3). However, Parzival rejected the offer 'mit zorne' (619,13). Here, it seems that Orgeluse uses the word *zorn* to signal a perceived break in social relations between herself and Parzival that results from his rejection of her suit. This is comparable to the display of *zorn* put on by Ampflise's envoys when Gahmuret finally

<sup>221</sup> E.g. 267,24; 270,30; 276,26 etc. See 1.2.2 above for the connection between anger and revenge.

rejects Ampflise's suit (see 3.1.5 above). This interpretation seems to be confirmed by Orgeluse's continued hostility to Parzival when she is obliged to kiss him (696,8-14) and when he is to dine with her in Gawan's tent, a hostility that is abandoned only in deference to Gawan's wishes (697,12-20).<sup>222</sup>

### 3.3.4.4 Urjans

Wolfram's version of the Urjans story (524,9-525,8; 525,11-529,1) is six times as long as Chrétien's tale of Greoreas (7109-31) and contains a wealth of additional detail, including references to the *zorn* of Artus (526,8) and of Urjans's victim (528,10), neither of whom play more than a passive role in the French text. Furthermore, the entire episode casts an interesting light on Gawan, who acts to assuage the *zorn* of both Artus and the victim.

The reference to Artus's anger is of particular interest, as it is the only instance in *Parzival* in which Artus is specifically associated with this emotion.<sup>223</sup> In *Le Conte du Graal*, there is no opportunity for Arthur to show anger, for he is not directly involved in Greoreas's case. Although Arthur guarantees women protection under the law (7121-25), it is Gauvain who exercises justice in the case of Greoreas (7111-15; 7126-31; 7132f.), and Greoreas's actions are presented as revenge for his punishment (7137).

In *Parzival*, Urjans's offence emerges as more serious, for his victim was on an embassy to Artus (525,15f.) and thus should have enjoyed 'des landes vride' (524,27) (Nellmann 1994, II: 710; Matthias 1984: 34). Furthermore, both rapist and victim are guests in Artus's kingdom (525,19).<sup>224</sup> Artus's anger seems to derive from his embarrassment:

er sprach 'die werlt sol riuwen  
dirre vermalde mein.  
ôwê daz ie der tag erschein,  
bî des liehte disiu nôt geschach,  
unt dâ man mir gerihtes jach,  
unt dâ ich hiute rihter bin.' (526,10-15)

Although Urjans is condemned to death by hanging (527,19-22), events take a strange turn when Urjans appeals to Gawan's sense of honour, claiming to have

<sup>222</sup> Compare her feelings towards Gramoflanz (see 3.3.4.3.2 above).

<sup>223</sup> In *Le Conte du Graal*, references to Arthur's *ire* (854, 1215f., 9200) or *corrouz* (1283, 4332, 9107) seem to represent exclusively *ire-douleur*. However, Kleiber 1978 refers specifically only to 854 (131, 135, 141 and 143) and 9200 (163).

surrendered on the understanding that his life would be spared (527,24f.). An ironic situation now arises, in which Gawan's skill at defusing anger is seen in a highly dubious light. He must apply all his skill to persuade the victim 'lât iuch von zorne kâren' (528,10), falling back on the old chestnut that she 'asked for it' (528,3-5). In this context, it is impossible to distinguish between *zorn* as the public expression of outrage requiring justice and *zorn* as a personal reaction to an infringement of honour, since both these aspects of *zorn* are likely to be in play.

Gawan has to call in all his favours for Artus (528,11-16) and play on his ties of kinship with Ginover (528,17-21). It is the queen's influence which is ultimately decisive (528,23). Yet it must remain doubtful whether Urjans could actually be offered *sicherheit* (Nellmann 1994, II: 711 on 527,25). This would be the quite proper outcome of normal knightly combat, but seems out of place in the pursuit of a criminal. It therefore appears that Gawan is confused between his role as a knight and his role as an agent of the law. At the moment of capture, he sees his role as delivering Urjans to the king (525,27-30), but when Urjans appeals to his honour in public, he reverts to the role of victorious combatant.

Both Gawan and Artus emerge from the episode in an unfavourable light. Artus's distaste for the proceedings evidently allows him to be easily persuaded to commute the death sentence to four weeks eating with the dogs. Orgeluse for one certainly sees this as failure to exact sufficient penalty (529,7f.). Gawan, on the other hand, has now been duped twice by Urjans. Fearing loss of honour — 'ich vorhte ân al mîn êre wesn' (527,26), he intervenes to save the life of a man whom he deems to be virtually without honour: 'dem ich nu kranker êren gan' (527,16). The juxtaposition of the shameless Urjans and shame-obsessed Gawan seems to underline the irony. Whereas Greoreas harbours a grudge against Gauvain, Urjans, who has every reason to be grateful to Gawan, is unreformed and ungrateful and resents Gawan's role in his apprehension (524,11-16).

A finally irony derives from the fact that it is Orgeluse who takes in hand the proper punishment of Urjans. Her motives for so doing are not explicitly stated, although one may speculate that her treatment at the hands of Gramoflanz may have influenced her

---

<sup>224</sup> Nellmann 1994 is silent on this line and Martin (1976: 391) simply comments: 'durch diesen Hinweis wird der Vorwurf gegen den Hof des Artus abgewehrt.' However, Urjans has surely compounded his offence by infringing the rules of hospitality and placing Artus in an embarrassing position. This would seem to be borne out by Artus's reaction (526,10-15).



actions. Nevertheless, she is a character who, at this stage in the narrative, is strongly associated with anger (see 3.3.4.3 above). It is perhaps the closest that Wolfram comes to suggesting that there may be a place for righteous anger in the administration of justice.<sup>225</sup> Certainly, Gawan's role as conciliator in the Urjans episode is shown to work against him and against natural justice. It is the first discordant note in an otherwise uniform picture of Gawan as the great peacemaker.

### 3.3.5 Conclusions

The Gawan episodes in *Parzival* are packed with references to anger that are, for the most part, without precedent in *Le Conte du Graal*. However, of all the characters that appear in the Gawan episodes, the only person with an obviously angry appearance is Malcreatiure, with his short, spiky hair (517,25-27; 521,12), and the only gestures that signify anger are Gawan's angry glance at the *garzûn* in Bearosche (360,18-20) and Beacurs's springing to his feet to defend Gawan (323,3), although Kingrimursel, in tearing his hair and wringing his hands (411,7-9), may also be displaying anger (see 1.2.1 above).

Once again, *zorn* is accompanied by a 'desire of retaliation' as Meljanz takes umbrage at Obie's rejection of his suit and at an assumed lack of respect from Lyppaut. Meljanz's wounded honour finds expression not only in his own *zorn*, but in the fierce aggression of the troops on the battlefield. Once again, *zorn* leads to *vîntschaft* and *tôt* (see 3.2.5 above). The 'desire of retaliation' also fuels Orgeluse's *zorn*, as she seeks to find a knight who will take revenge on Gramoflanz for the loss of Cidegast and the wounding of Anfortas.<sup>226</sup> Finally, the *zorn* of Urjans's victim (528,10) also represents a 'desire of retaliation', this time through the formal channel of the law. The surprising thing is how unsatisfactory the law proves as a means of obtaining redress in this case. As Orgeluse points out, violence is far more satisfying and also more effective (529,2-16).

*Zorn* is often accompanied by cursing or harsh words and this is particularly associated with female anger, since Obie, Bene, and Orgeluse all give vent to their anger in this way. Where such *zorn* has wider-reaching consequences, as in the case of

<sup>225</sup> One is reminded, once again, of the lines from *Der deutsche Cato*: 'Du solt bî manegem bilde nemen / welch dinc dir sülle missezemen; / dem vrûmen soltu volgen, / dem bæsen wis erbolgen' (379-82). Urjans seems to be a suitable object for anger, if ever there was one.

<sup>226</sup> Gramoflanz is, of course, only indirectly responsible for Anfortas's wound, in so far as Anfortas was wounded in the service of Orgeluse in one of her previous attempts to find an avenger.

Obie and of Orgeluse, the narrator finds it necessary to excuse it, pointing to the problematic nature of female anger that challenges the male prerogative (see 1.7 above).

Gawan himself is not particularly associated with anger. Although he is repeatedly subjected to insults and humiliation by Obie and Orgeluse, he never loses his temper with either of these ladies, although he is not above pointing out to Orgeluse the error of her ways (612,1-20). Similarly, he is not angered by Kingrimursel's challenge or by Plippalinet's suggestion that he has raped Bene: he simply sets out to prove his innocence. Indeed, the episode at Schanpfanzun is almost entirely devoid of anger, despite the fact that Gawan finds himself wrongly accused of raping Antikonie. In fact, Gawan displays anger on only two occasions: firstly, when the *garzûn* approaches him at Bearosche, and secondly when he meets Malcreatiure. In both cases, his *zorn* is brief and serves to emphasize his noble, knightly status and to put lesser mortals in their place.<sup>227</sup>

However, Gawan is more than just a man of calm temperament. In the *Blutstropfenszene*, he emerges as a peacemaker and his behaviour stands in marked contrast to that of Segradors and Keie. Where Segradors demonstrates impatience and hotheadedness and Keie represents a generally choleric temperament, Gawan emerges as a model of calm and clear thinking whose actions are governed by reflection and analysis. By introducing points of comparison with Segradors, Keie and Parzival, Wolfram also highlights the difference between Gawan and Parzival at this stage. This is also evident from their very different reactions to public disgrace. Whereas Parzival flies into a rage at God (332,1-8), Gawan busies himself with preparations for departure (335,1-30) and seems to take Kingrimursel's challenge in his stride.

Gawan's peacemaking activities extend to effecting *suone* between Meljanz and Lyppaut and between Meljanz and Obie, although he has to engage the services of Obilot in order to reconcile the lovers. He also has a part to play in the reconciliation between Orgeluse and Gramoflanz, and between Orgeluse and Parzival, since it is only in deference to Gawan's wishes that Orgeluse agrees to kiss these two.

*Zorn* seems to have symbolic significance on two occasions, namely as a mark of the breakdown in social relations between Orgeluse and Parzival and as the public expression of outrage requiring recompense in law in the case of Urjans's victim.

---

<sup>227</sup> For *zorn* as the prerogative of the male nobility, see 1.7 above.

There are a number of examples that demonstrate the connection between *zorn*, *hôchvart* and *unfuoge*, for instance, Meljanz (344,13-17; 348,28-30), Poydiconjunz (348,28-30) and Obie (347,7f.; 353,18-21). However, where Meljanz and Obie might be excused on account of their youth or because of the power of *minne*, Poydiconjunz ought to know better.<sup>228</sup> Similarly, Orgeluse's *zorn* and *hôchvart* (535,12) are not excusable on grounds of age, but derive from a particular set of tragic circumstances.

The connection between *minne* and *zorn* seems to be a persistent one, relevant to the relationship between Meljanz and Obie and between Gawan and Orgeluse. Indeed, the narrator's comment 'Von minn noch zornes vil geschiht' (366,1) suggests that Wolfram considered this to be an issue with contemporary relevance. It becomes apparent that love can both cause and overcome anger, since *minne* eventually triumphs over the *zorn* between Obie and Meljanz (396,21-24) and Gawan is able to persuade Orgeluse to be formally reconciled with both Parzival and Gramoflanz.<sup>229</sup>

Book VII illustrates many of the negative aspects of *zorn*. It is shown to be highly disruptive to relationships, dividing lover from lover, sister from sister, and lord from vassal. Meljanz's *zorn* brings in its wake regrets for the court in general and Obie in particular (347,15-18). *Zorn* puts an end to Lyppaut's *freude* (347,30) and is strong enough to overwhelm Obie's *kiusche* (365,16-21).

Finally, the Lit marveile episode represents a special case, serving to illustrate both Gawan's *fortitudo* and his *patientia*. It is a microcosm, within which the *zorn* of the brawny rustic and of the lion is at once a sign of the diabolical aspects of the trial, a measure of the *furor heroicus* that the victorious hero must counter, and a symbol of the trials and tribulations of love that the successful lover must overcome.

Whilst, in general, Gawan emerges from every test of his *fortitudo* and *patientia* with flying colours, a discordant note is struck by his handling of Urjans. Here, a somewhat excessive concern with his own personal honour and reputation and insufficient attention to Urjans's utter baseness leads Gawan to apply his diplomatic skills to obtaining leniency for a worthless conman and rapist. It is in part this concern

<sup>228</sup> Wolfram implies elsewhere that *unfuoge* might be excusable on grounds of youth when discussing the power of *minne* (533,9-14).

<sup>229</sup> Orgeluse provides the most graphic illustration of the difference between public behaviour and private emotion. There is every indication that she retains her distaste for both Parzival and Gramoflanz in private. However, in public her *zorn* is set aside. In this, she has some resemblance to Laudine in *Iwein* (see 3.2 above).

with personal honour that also makes it difficult for Gawan to decline combat against Gramoflanz, even though victory would spell disaster for his own sister. Orgeluse's intervention to mete out proper justice (death) to Urjans seems highly appropriate.

### 3.4 The Narrator and *zorn*

There is no precedent in *Le Conte du Graal* for the anger of the author, the narrator or the author's alleged source. This is due to the absence of narratorial intervention in the French text. In *Parzival*, by contrast, the narrator is omnipresent, commenting on events and addressing both audience and protagonists and even abstract concepts, such as Frou Minne, from time to time. Anger comes to the fore most obviously in the so-called *Selbstverteidigung*:

Swer nu wîben sprichet baz,  
deiswâr daz lâz ich âne haz:  
ich vriesche gerne ir freude breit.  
wan einer bin ich unbereit  
dienstlicher triuwe:  
mîn zorn ist immer niuwe  
gein ir, sît ich se an wanke sach.  
ich bin Wolfram von Eschenbach,  
unt kan ein teil mit sange,  
unt bin ein habendiu zange  
mînen zorn gein einem wîbe:  
diu hât mîme lîbe  
erboten solhe missetât,  
ine hân si hazzens keinen rât.  
dar umb hân ich der andern haz.  
ôwê war umbe tuont si daz?  
alein sî mir ir hazzen leit,  
ez ist iedoch ir wîpheit,  
sît ich mich versprochen hân  
und an mir selben missetân;  
daz lîhte nimmer mêr geschiht. (114,5-25)

The references to 'mîn zorn' and 'ich bin Wolfram von Eschenbach' point to the author's close association with the sentiments being expressed, but it is impossible to know whether the poet is here referring to an autobiographical experience. Indeed, it is arguable that this is unlikely to be the case, since any reference to a relationship between the poet and an unnamed woman would presumably be lost on most of the audience or readership. Instead, it would appear that what is being depicted here is something akin to the traditional relationship between the Minnesänger and his lady-

love. Indeed, Wolfram's boast that he 'kan ein teil mit sange' seems to reinforce this view.<sup>230</sup>

The relationship between Minnesänger and lady-love demands reciprocity. Service (*dienst*) and reward (*lôn*) are intimately connected. However, whereas the Minnesänger normally extols the virtues of his lady-love in anticipation of receiving her favours, Wolfram is here in a rather different position. As a narrative poem, *Parzival* does not afford the poet the opportunity to praise his lady directly: instead, she is offered the reflected glory of being the inspiration behind the work. This is made explicit at the end of the poem:

guotiu wîp, hânt die sin,  
deste werder ich in bin,  
op mir decheiniu guotes gan,  
sît ich diz mæ̃r volsprochen hân.  
ist daz durh ein wîp geschehn,  
diu muoz mir süezer worte jehn. (827,25-30)

It is also clear, both from the *Selbstverteidigung* and from this final passage, that Wolfram's relationship to womankind at large is intimately connected to the particular relationship referred to. His hostility towards one woman engenders the hostility of all women towards him — 'dar umb hân ich der andern haz' (114,19), whilst the good disposition of 'women of discernment' (827,25: Hatto (trans.) 1980: 411) towards him necessarily entails a favourable reception by one in particular.

However, there is another point at which Wolfram mentions his relationship to a particular woman in the context of his relationship to the many. Significantly, this occurs at the end of Book VI, just as the story begins to be devoted for the first time to the adventures of Gawan:

Nu weiz ich, swelch sinnec wîp,  
ob si hât getriwen lîp,

<sup>230</sup> Much hangs on the interpretation of 114,14f. Tongs as a symbol of enduring anger are not found elsewhere, as far as I know. In the Early-Modern period, however, the tongs are found in emblemata as a symbol of control of emotion (Henkel & Schöne 1996: cols. 1029f.). The emblem illustrated shows a heart gripped by tongs ('Herz in einer Zange') and is accompanied by text in Latin and German. The Latin text bears the title 'Affectus comprime' and reads: 'REGINA RATIO recta Regibus imperat, / Et dictat adfectus cohercere improbos. / Pareto rationi; catenis, vinculis / cohibe πάθη, tibi ut secundae res eant.' The German text reads: 'IN einer Zang ein Hertz hier gmalt / Zeiget vns an / wie gleicher Gestalt / Ein vernünfftiger Mensche soll / Sein eigen Begierd dämpffen wol. / Der sich selbs überwinden kan / Ist der Stärckst vnd Glückseligst Mann.' Could it be that Wolfram here refers to an anger that wells up again and again (114,10f.) but which he nevertheless keeps under control (114,14f.), rather than an enduring anger, as has been hitherto assumed? I can find no medieval parallel, but the text attached to the emblem cited is clearly inspired by Proverbs 16.32, which seems to be influential elsewhere in *Parzival* (see 3.2.4.1 and 3.3.4.2 above). The tongs appear once more in *Parzival* at 311,20, again in a context referring to 'wîp die wenkent' (311,23 — compare 114,10f.), which might permit interpretation as a symbol of control rather than tenacity.

diu diz mære geschriben siht,  
daz si mir mit wârheit giht,  
ich kunde wîben sprechen baz  
denne als ich sanc gein einer maz. (337,1-6)

Wolfram follows this immediately with a brief catalogue of female characters from the story so far: Belakane, Herzeloyde, Ginover, Jeschute and Cunneware.<sup>231</sup> All are referred to in the context of noble suffering or lament and are evidently being adduced as examples of the poet's sympathetic portrayal of women. He appears to admit to having been less than sympathetic to one woman in particular, just as he did earlier — 'sît ich mich versprochen hân' (114,23), and to be trying to make amends. Indeed, the continuation of the story seems to be dependent on this individual's tacit assent:

wolt ez gebieten mir ein munt,  
den doch ander füeze tragent  
dan die mir ze stegreif wagent. (337,28-30)<sup>232</sup>

It can be no coincidence that Gawan subsequently encounters three female characters who are presented in a much more ambivalent light. Having established his credentials as a sympathetic portrayer of women, Wolfram moves on to show female characters in an initially unfavourable light, only to redeem them. Thus Obie and Orgeluse are both characterized by *zorn*, but ultimately excused. Antikonie, on the other hand, is apparently too free with her favours, but actually a model of *triuwe*. By analogy, therefore, the hostility of women in general, and any one woman in particular, towards the poet need not be held against them. Furthermore, any adverse behaviour that the poet may have described may itself be wholly excusable.

However, there is potentially a much deeper significance to the analogy being drawn between women in general, one woman in particular, and the female characters in the text. *Minne* and relationships between men and women are the central theme of the Gawan adventures.<sup>233</sup> Although things turn out well for both Obie and Orgeluse, we are left in no doubt as to the potentially serious consequences of their *zorn*. At Bearosche, sister turns against sister, lord against vassal, lover against lover. The result is a war that threatens only destruction and misery. In Orgeluse's case, her anger has resulted in the

<sup>231</sup> The glaring omission from this catalogue is Condwiramurs, but I would suggest that this is quite deliberate.

<sup>232</sup> These lines seem to be generally accepted as referring to an unknown patroness (Nellmann 1994, II: 626; Hatto 1980: 175, fn.). Both Nellmann and Hatto cross-reference these lines to 827,29f.

<sup>233</sup> The theme of *dienst* and *lôn* is recurrent in Books VII, VIII and X-XIV. The protests of some of the male characters could just as easily be applied to the relationship between poet and womankind, viz. 'genâde doch bîm dienste stêt' (346,22) and 'wer mac minne ungedienet hân? / [. . .] / swem ist ze werder minne gâch, / dâ hæret dienst vor unde nâch' (511,12, 511,15f.).

wounding of Anfortas and brought the Grail Kingdom to its knees. It has also brought brother into conflict with potential brother-in-law and opens up the possibility of the entire Arthurian Kingdom being engulfed in bloodshed. It seems that the anger of women poses a particularly serious threat to society and, by analogy, the hostility to the poet of women in general, and the one woman in particular, is thrown open to question.<sup>234</sup>

The same point is made in another way when Feirefiz is received at Artus's court:

guot wîp man nie gezürnen sach,  
ob wert man nâch ir helfe sprach:  
si hât versagen unt wern bevor.  
giht man freude iht urbor,  
den zins muoz wâriu minne gebn.  
sus sah ich ie die werden lebn.  
dâ saz dienst unde lôn.  
ez ist ein helfecliche dôn,  
swâ friundîn rede wirt vernomn,  
diu friunde mac ze staten komn. (766,9-18)

Anger is inappropriate for a good woman and specifically inappropriate to 'wâriu minne'. The image of *dienst* and *lôn* sitting side by side encapsulates the proper relationship between man and woman, the idealized relationship between Minnesänger and lady-love. The latter aspect is underlined by the reference to 'ein helfecliche dôn': sweet words from a woman form the melody to the song that is the relationship between the sexes.<sup>235</sup> It can be no coincidence that, when Condwiramurs is re-united with Parzival, she states: 'nu solt ich zürnen: ine mac' (801,9).

Female hostility and aggression are consistently frowned on, except in contexts where they are manifestations of *triuwe*:

swâ harnaschrâmec wirt ein wîp,  
diu hât ir rehts vergezzen,  
sol man ir kiusche mezzen,  
sine tuoz dan durch ir triuwe. (409,12-15)<sup>236</sup>

By analogy, the hostility and aggression of Frou Minne are also decried. In the first apostrophe to Frou Minne (291,1-293,16), she is presented as the dominant power in an

<sup>234</sup> The incompatibility of *zorn* and *wîpheit* is also a theme in Gottfried's *Tristan* — see 1.7 above.

<sup>235</sup> The notion of words as melody carries additional ironic force.

<sup>236</sup> Similarly, in *Willehalm*, Gyburc's donning of armour reflects her loyalty to Willehalm.

encounter that has a distinctly military flavour.<sup>237</sup> The narrator's anger towards her is ineffectual:<sup>238</sup>

doch sît ir mir ze wol geborn,  
daz gein iu mîn kranker zorn  
immer solde bringen wort. (292,13-15)

Later, Frou Minne's anger towards Gawan mirrors the attitude of Orgeluse:

niemen sol des lachen,  
daz alsus werlîchen man  
ein wîp enschumpfieren kan.  
wohrî woch, waz sol daz sîn?  
dâ tuot frou minne ir zûrnen schîn  
an dem der prîs hât bejagt. (584,22-27)

Again, the power of female hostility is demonized, and the male sex is presented as disadvantaged in this sphere. The implication is that, in the *Selbstverteidigung*, Wolfram portrays the poet (himself) in a situation where he cannot win. Female anger, whether emanating from one individual or from womankind at large or from love itself, personified in the female, is a terrifying force. The poet, as author of a narrative work, is hamstrung: the conventional weapon of the Minnesang poets, praise of the lady-love, cannot avail him, for all his skill ('ich bin Wolfram von Eschenbach, / unt kan ein teil mit sange': 114,12f.). This is broadly analogous to Gawan's position, where all his knightly prowess apparently cannot avail him on the battlefield of love.

In the *Selbstverteidigung*, Wolfram protests:

Sîn lop hinket ame spat,  
swer allen frouwen sprichet mat  
durch sîn eines frouwen. (115,5-7)

This has been convincingly interpreted as an allusion to a poem by Reinmar (Nellmann 1994, II: 516).<sup>239</sup> However, it is also an apology for failing to sing the praises of one woman in particular, in the traditional manner of the Minnesang. Wolfram moves from the particular to the general and back again quite effortlessly, following this with the bold statement: 'swelhiu mich minnet umbe sanc, / sô dunket mich ir witze kranc'

<sup>237</sup> The idea of love as a battlefield is a commonplace dating back to Antiquity and exemplified in the works of Ovid, which enjoyed particular popularity from the twelfth century onwards (Kistler 1993: 124-29).

<sup>238</sup> The poet/narrator emerges as an individual with a tendency to irascibility. Apart from the *Selbstverteidigung* and the passage cited here, a combative stance is also suggested at the very point where the narrator defends his adherence to the wishes of his elusive source, Kyot: 'Swere mich dervon ê frâgte / unt drumbe mit mir bâgte, / ob ichs im niht sagte, / umprîs der dran bejagte' (453,1-4). If, as has been suggested, Kyot is but a mask for the poet's own imagination, it is in character that Kyot himself should be portrayed as similarly combative in his defence of the storyline: 'Ob von Troys meister Cristjân / disem mære hât unreht getân, / daz mac wol zûrnen Kyôt, / der uns diu rehten mære enbôt' (827,1-4).



(115,13f.). However this relates to Wolfram's own social standing, it is clear that he does not expect to gain the affection of womankind through the conventions of the Minnesang.<sup>240</sup> Indeed, use of the Minnesang conventions by no means guarantees true empathy with the plight of lovers. Again, when describing Gawan's love-pangs, the narrator comments: 'maneger hât von minnen sanc, / den nie diu minne alsô getwanc' (587,7f.). By inference, the narrator sets narrative poetry above the Minnesang. By appealing to true lovers to lament Gawan's fate — 'ez solten minnære klagen, / waz dem von Norwæge was' (587,10f.) the narrator implies his own membership of this group and invites the audience to identify with him. It is through his narrative skill that Wolfram must rely on gaining the favour of women in particular, and of his audience/readership in general.

Gawan is, of course, ultimately successful in his wooing of Orgeluse and finds sexual and social fulfilment through the consummation of their relationship. The prospects for the poet are much less clear, given the conditional note upon which the poem ends. Clearly, however, the poet still values the esteem of women and his position is in this respect analogous to that of Anfortas. After being healed, the latter resolves to fight in the service of the Grail, rather than in honour of women (819,22-24). This option is not available to the poet, for we are told that after Parzival's speech:

vil liut liez dô verderben  
nâch dem grâle gewerbes list,  
dâ von er noch verborgen ist. (786,10-12)

However, even Anfortas, who has suffered so greatly from the anger of womankind, can forgive them. These words surely reflect the poet's own view:

ein wîp gab mir herzesêr.  
Idoch ist iemmer al mîn haz  
gein wîben vollecliche laz:  
hûch manlîch vreude kumt von in,  
swie klein dâ wære mîn gewin. (819,30-820,4)

### 3.5 Divine Wrath

Whereas in *Le Conte du Graal*, reference to the anger of anyone other than the protagonists is entirely absent, in *Parzival* the situation is quite different (see 3.4 above). In addition to the anger of the narrator, Wolfram makes reference to divine

---

<sup>239</sup> The question as to how Reinmar's chess metaphor should be interpreted is not relevant to the views expressed here.

<sup>240</sup> Nellmann (1994, II: 516) on 115,11 disputes whether any inference about Wolfram's social status can be drawn here: 'Im Kontext der Minnesangpolemik ist es ein Bekenntnis zur Ideologie des Ritterromans.'

wrath — not only to the wrath of the Christian God, but also to the wrath of the pagan gods.

The Christian God's predisposition to both *minne* and *zorn* has already been discussed (see 3.2.3.5 above). However, God's wrath can have eschatological as well as contemporary significance and this would seem to be alluded to in the narrator's brief aside to the audience/reader as he introduces Antikonie:

nu hœr dise âventiure  
der getriwe unt der gehiure:  
ich enruoche umb d'ungetriuwen.  
mit dürkelen riuwen  
hânt se alle ir sælekeit verlorn:  
des muoz ir sêle lîden zorn. (404,11-16)

The implication seems to be that the 'dishonest' (Hatto (trans.) 1980: 208) or 'faithless' are doomed to suffer the wrath of God (Schmid 1996: 382, fn.12). The rejection of true penance and consequent loss of *sælekeit* point to eternal damnation. As Trevrizent later says:

der schuldige âne riuwe  
fliuht die gotlîchen triuwe:  
swer ab wandelt sünden schulde,  
der dient nâch werder hulde. (466,11-14)

Nevertheless, in the context of an address to the audience/readers, the narrator's remarks (404,11-16) may be nothing more than a polemic against hostile critics.<sup>241</sup>

Even less clear-cut is a possible reference to the wrath of God found much earlier in the work, after Herzeloyde's reference to the birth and death of Christ for mankind:

swes lîp sîn zürnen ringet,  
des sêle unsamfte dinget,  
swie kiuscher sî und wære.  
des weiz ich wâriu mære. (113,23-26)

This short passage has attracted considerable scholarly interest and widely differing interpretations (e.g. Bertau 1983a; Nellmann 1992; Schmid 1996). Nellmann (1992: 195f.) has rightly drawn attention to the considerable manuscript variations preserved for 113,23, and there seems little reason to disagree with his preference for the reading from MS G: 'swes lîp sînen zorn erringet', which certainly overcomes the difficulty of translating this line. The general consensus seems to be that this is a reference to Herzeloyde's earlier thoughts of suicide.<sup>242</sup> The implication is that, had Herzeloyde committed suicide, she would have known God's wrath.

<sup>241</sup> Nellmann (1994, II: 646) points to the parallel with 2,17-22.

<sup>242</sup> This is the conclusion which Bertau 1983a and Nellmann 1992 arrive at by different means. Schmid 1996 is sceptical.

The only direct reference to the wrath of the pagan gods is made by Lahfilirost, when he realizes that Gahmuret has defeated Razalic and says of the Moorish army that the latter led: ‘ein zornic got in daz gebôt, / daz uns hie suohten mit ir her’ (43,28f.). The use of the indefinite article (‘ein zornic got’) would appear to point to a pagan deity rather than the Christian God. The defeated heathens are thus portrayed as being at the mercy of pagan divine wrath.

Although there is no other direct reference to the anger of the pagan gods, it is worth noting that Juno is twice mentioned as Feirefiz’s patron goddess (748,17; 750,5). On three occasions, specific reference is made to her control over the winds at sea (750,4-10; 753,4-7; 767,2-5). This is by no means a normal association for Juno (Pauly VI (1999): cols. 72-77). However, it is an association which Wolfram would have encountered in Heinrich von Veldeke’s *Eneasroman*, where Juno’s anger is responsible for the misfortune of Eneas and, specifically, for the storm that drives him to Carthage.<sup>243</sup> In sharp contrast to the *Eneasroman*, where Juno’s influence is malign, Feirefiz presents Juno as a beneficent influence and thus styles himself as an anti-type to Eneas. Far from suffering the wrath of the gods, Feirefiz seems to be particularly favoured.

Finally, it is necessary to say a word about the problematic reference to the anger of the planets Mars and/or Jupiter and their adverse influence on the suffering of Anfortas:<sup>244</sup>

nu hete diu wîle des erbiten,  
daz Mars oder Jupiter  
wâren komen wider her  
al zornec mit ir loufte  
(sô was er der verkoufte)  
dar si sich von sprunge huoben ê. (789,4-9)

<sup>243</sup> It must remain a moot point whether Wolfram knew the Old French *Roman d’Eneas* and/or Virgil’s *Aeneid* in addition to the *Eneasroman*. It is beyond the scope of this thesis to prove this either way. Virgil is named at 656,17, but in connection with his legendary magic powers rather than his literary prowess. More suggestive are the references to Jupiter, who is not named in the *Eneasroman* at all, but who does feature in the *Roman d’Eneas* and in the *Aeneid*. Juno’s hatred of Eneas and the Trojans is mentioned early on in the *Eneasroman* (En. 21,12-21; 21,29-22,15; 29,32f.), but she is also worshipped in Carthage with the object of making that city powerful above all others (En. 27,28-28,3), which puts her in vain opposition to the destiny of Rome (En. 28,4-10). Draesner 1993 does not deal with Feirefiz’s invocations of Jupiter and Juno.

<sup>244</sup> This passage has been treated most recently by Groos 1995: 200-03. The problems hinge around the imputation of a malign influence to the planet Jupiter, which is elsewhere unattested (but see below), and the MSS variations for 789,5 (MS D: ‘Mârss oder Jupiter’; MS G: ‘Mars Jupiter’; MS dg: ‘Mars unde Jupiter’). Groos argues that the reading of the MSS of the d and g classes, which is the only syntactically correct reading, makes sense in the context of a conjunction of Mars and Jupiter.

Whatever the precise meaning of these words, the ‘angry’ aspect of Mars and/or Jupiter would appear to be the manifestation of divine wrath in nature.<sup>245</sup> Anfortas is thus in the opposite situation to Feirefiz, who praises the gods, planetary influence and the elements in what appears to be ranking order:

al mîne gote des gêret sint.  
 mîn gotinne Jûnô  
 dis prîses mac wol wesen vrô.  
 mîn kreftec got Jupiter  
 dirre sælden was mîn wer.  
 gote unt gotinne,  
 iwer kraft ich immer minne.  
 geêrt sî des plânêten schîn,  
 dar inne diu reise mîn  
 nâch âventiure wart getân  
 gein dir, vorhtlîch sûezer man,  
 daz mich von dîner hant gerou.  
 geêrt sî luft unde tou,  
 daz hiute morgen ûf mich reis. (748,16-29)<sup>246</sup>

Thus it seems that the pagan gods are assumed to exhibit wrath in much the same way as the Christian God, although the superiority of the Christian God is never in doubt. Wolfram’s concept of divine wrath seems to be very much in line with its portrayal in the Bible, which is perhaps not surprising. What is more unexpected is its importance to the text, adding depth to the cosmic significance of Parzival’s progress towards accession to the Grail kingship.

### 3.6 Other Examples of *zorn*

There are three occurrences of *zorn* not accounted for so far. The first of these is to be found when hostilities resume between Gawan and Lischoys Gwelljus after the latter

<sup>245</sup> If the planetary influence here is understood as the manifestation of divine wrath in nature, the imputation of wrath to Jupiter becomes unproblematic. As the chief deity in the Roman pantheon, Jupiter fulfilled many of the functions assumed by the Christian God. This is quite clear from Wolfram’s text, where the God Jupiter is mentioned by name nine times. Jupiter is ‘kreftec’ (748,19; 810,27) and, according to Feirefiz’s words to Parzival, exercises power over creation (as *deus artifex*): ‘Jupiter hât sînen vlîz, / werder helt, geleit an dich’ (749,16f. — compare Sigune’s original reaction to Parzival at 140,4f.: ‘si vrâgte in ê wie er hieze, / und jach er trûege den gotes vlîz’). His power over life and death is further emphasised by Feirefiz’s exclamation: ‘Jupiter, diz wunder schrîp: / dîn kraft tet uns helfe kuont, / daz se unser sterben understuont’ (752,20-22 — compare 744,22-24: ‘zurteile stêtz in beiden / vor der hôhsten hende: daz diu ir sterben wende’). Feirefiz’s threat to abandon Jupiter if his love-pangs for Repanse do not abate (812,28-30) is an exact parallel to Parzival’s earlier renunciation of the Christian God (332,1-8), but, unlike Parzival’s attitude, this is actually a necessary pre-condition to marriage and Christian salvation, symbolized here by the ability to see the Grail: ‘Jupiter dînen got / muostu durch si verliesen’ (815,6f.). Jupiter’s power is also clearly limited by his inability to console Feirefiz to the same extent as Secundille’s love (768,29f.). Jupiter was specifically associated with rain and storms and often depicted armed with a thunderbolt, thus an association with anger does not seem out of place. The association of Mars with anger was well known, as Groos has pointed out, and he is specifically named in the *Eneasroman* as ‘hêre Mars des wîges got’ (*En.* 157,40).

has refused to surrender.<sup>247</sup> The narrator describes how they rush at one another again, this time abandoning their battered shields: ‘dô huop sich êrste niwer zorn’ (541,23). In this case, *zorn* refers to *furor heroicus* (see 1.7.3 above) and marks the renewal of mutual aggression between the two knights.

Another example of *zorn* occurs when Arnive is unable to persuade Gawan’s messenger to reveal the purpose of his embassy. Book XIII consequently opens with the memorable line ‘Arnîve zorn bejagete’ (627,1). Arnive’s anger derives from impatience to know what Gawan is up to and has every appearance of being culpable anger, as defined by Gregory the Great (see 1.7 above). However, although we are told ‘doch truoc si ûfen knappen haz’ (627,11), leaving open the possibility that she might take revenge on the squire at some future date, there is no evidence in the text that Arnive’s anger has any consequence and it thus stands as an example of ineffectual and irrelevant female anger (see 1.7 above).

The third example occurs towards the end of the text, as the narrator tells the story of the Duchess of Brabant. When she rejects offers of marriage from a number of noble suitors, we are told ‘si hete sich gar an got verlân, / swaz zornes wart gein ir getân’ (824,19f.). In this context, *zorn* signifies the possible aggression that she may face as a result of her decision.

### 3.7 Conclusions

The numerous references to *zorn* in *Parzival* suggest that Wolfram was far more concerned than Chrétien with the problem of anger. Parzival himself has to learn how to deal with anger in others and how to control his own anger. Indeed, the abandonment of anger seems to be a key element in his accession to the Grail kingship. This is implied on his first visit to the Grail Castle during his encounter with the *redespæher man*, when he is incited by the Grail community ‘schütet ab iu zornes last’ (229,22). Parzival’s failure to abandon anger at this point mirrors his failure to ask the question. Book IX is devoted largely to the abandonment of Parzival’s anger towards God, whilst the abandonment of his anger towards Cundrie la surziere immediately precedes her announcement of his accession.

---

<sup>246</sup> The text does not specify which planet is meant by ‘des plânêten schîn’. It could be a circumlocution for the sun (unless Feirefiz set off at night), but this is by no means certain.

<sup>247</sup> This is without precedent in *Le Conte du Graal*, where Gauvain is attacked by the nephew of Greoras, whom he defeats without further ado and of whom there is no further mention (7347-59).

Gawan presents a complete contrast to Parzival. Skilled in every aspect of courtly behaviour, Gawan is a model of patience and an inveterate peacemaker. He patiently endures the taunts of Obie and Orgeluse and doggedly insists on his innocence of the charges made by Kingrimursel. His anger surfaces only when his honour is impugned by Obie's *garzûn* and by Malcreatiure and, in each case, he uses the minimum force necessary to restore order. A discordant note is struck only by his handling of Urjans, when his concern for his own honour leads Gawan to subvert the normal course of justice.

Indeed, Urjans illustrates the point made forcibly in *Der deutsche Cato*: 'dem vrumen soltu volgen, / dem böesen wis erbolgen' (381f.). With the possible exception of Meljahkanz, there is no more shameless villain in *Parzival* than Urjans and it is ironic that it is left to a woman, Orgeluse, to ensure that he gets his just deserts. However, Keie provides ample proof that the principle should not be applied indiscriminately, since things are not always as they seem. In particular, Keie's beating of Cunneware is seen to be both unbecoming and improper.

Keie also provides an example of a man who seems to exercise little control over his anger, giving vent to it immediately when Cunneware laughs and Antanor speaks, and harbouring it indefinitely when Gawan does not avenge his discomfiture by Parzival. The sentiment espoused by Proverbs 16.32 — 'Melior est patiens viro forti: et qui dominatur animo suo, expugnatore urbium' — never seems to be far from Wolfram's thoughts. It is epitomized in the Lit marveile episode, when Gawan has to endure all the perils that are thrown at him, but is also in evidence after Parzival's combat with Gawan. It may also underlie Wolfram's own image of himself as a 'tongs of anger' (114,14f.).

Gahmuret, like Gawan, possesses all the courtly accomplishments and is an exemplary warrior in the field. However, whereas Gawan's reaction to Kingrimursel's challenge is 'ine weiz war umbe ich strîten sol, / ouch entuot mir strîten niht sô wol' (323,27f.), these words would be unthinkable on Gahmuret's lips. This is a man for

whom life without fighting is unbearable (54,17-20; 96,27-97,4). His way of life is thus incompatible with peacemaking on a grand scale.<sup>248</sup>

Of all the situations that may give rise to anger, the one that most concerns Wolfram is love. The interaction of love and anger can be seen most graphically at Bearosche, but it is also relevant to Gawan's relationship with Orgeluse and to the narrator's relationship with women in general and with one woman in particular. Like anger, love can overwhelm reason, but love can cure anger as well as inflame it.

*Zorn* is often a by-product or outward sign of *haz* or enmity. It is therefore unsurprising that Wolfram seems to set great store by *suone*, which involves setting aside *zorn* and *haz*. Gahmuret reconciles Kaylet and Hardiz, Parzival reconciles Orilus and Jeschute, Gawan reconciles Meljanz and Lyppaut and facilitates the reconciliation between Meljanz and Obie. He also reconciles Orgeluse and Parzival. Finally, at a great 'suone teidinc' (729,5), Artus reconciles Orgeluse and Gramoflanz as well as Gawan and Gramoflanz, thus paving the way for Gramoflanz and Itonje to be married. Artus and Feirefiz also play an important part in effecting the reconciliation between Cundrie and Parzival (779,27f.).

---

<sup>248</sup> His reconciliation of Hardiz and Kaylet forms part of his wedding celebrations (100,19-25) and is perhaps to be seen as a favour to Kaylet (89,29f.). Since neither Kaylet nor Hardiz is heard of again, there are no further implications. By contrast, there is no evidence that Gahmuret even suggests reconciliation between the Baruc and the brothers Ipomidon and Pompeius. It also appears that he neglects to honour his undertaking to reconcile Vridebrant with Belakane (58,9-19).

## Chapter 4: Summary of Conclusions

In Hartmann's Arthurian romances, *zorn* arises in a number of contexts. It often occurs as a mark of authority. Thus, Erec's *zorn* towards Enite is a mark of his authority over his wife, whilst the *zorn* of the wild man towards the beasts in *Iwein* symbolizes the authority of mankind over nature at a primitive level. Similarly, in *Iwein*, Artus's *zorn* is an aspect of his authority as king. Both Erec and Iwein have occasion to feel righteous anger: the former when he sees the giants mistreating Cadoc, the latter when his lion is injured. This represents the authority of good over evil.

Hartmann also frequently uses *zorn* as a symbol of hostility. It signals the mortal enmity between Laudine and Iwein and between Askalon and Kalogrenant. It also marks the break in social relations between Meljaganz and Artus in *Iwein*, when Artus initially refuses to grant Meljaganz a boon. Additionally, *zorn* represents *furor heroicus* in Erec's encounters with Iders, Galoain, and Mabonagrín and Iwein's encounter with Askalon. In all four cases, both combatants are overcome in equal measure by *zorn*.

Iwein's *zorn* and *tobesuht* (3233) is a special case, where *zorn* is a recognized symptom of *melancholia*. However, *zorn* is also found as a symptom of *tristitia* or *desperatio*, as in Enite's lament at Erec's apparent death and Laudine's lament at Askalon's funeral.

The *zorn* of the various giants who appear in *Erec* and *Iwein* marks them as extra-courtly figures, unresponsive to the usual niceties of courtly behaviour. This is also true of the wild man in *Iwein* and even the mad Iwein, to some extent. It is also noticeable that female anger is almost always immoderate, inappropriate, or irrelevant, the sole exception being Lunete's anger at Iwein's intention to rush out to Laudine at the precise moment where he is being sought by Askalon's men. This clearly has a positive, corrective function. Of the female characters in *Iwein* who give way to *zorn*, only the Lady of Narison seems capable of controlling her anger. Laudine, Lunete, and Ginover, on the other hand, are all flawed when it comes to displaying *zorn*, whilst in *Erec*, apart from Enite's *desperatio*, the issue of female *zorn* is never addressed.

It can be seen, therefore, that *zorn* is highly significant for Hartmann in social terms. Physiological signs or symbols of anger are few, being restricted principally to the appearance of the wild man in *Iwein* and to the behaviour of Galoain and Oringles in *Erec*, and of Ginover, Lunete and Laudine in *Iwein*. Galoain and Oringles are thus



distinguished by their immoderate and inappropriate anger from characters such as Erec and Artus, whose display of *zorn* is entirely in keeping with their position within the male nobility.

By contrast, Wolfram shows a much wider interest in the causes and consequences of *zorn*. In *Parzival*, *zorn* often accompanies a 'desire of retaliation': this can be seen at Patelamunt and Kanvoleis, and in the actions of Orilus, Ither, Clamide, Meljanz and Orgeluse. The 'desire of retaliation' may also be important for Lähelin, although this is not made explicit, and for Urjans's victim, who pursues her case in law.

The focus on retaliation or revenge leads naturally to an exploration of the origins and effects of *zorn*. The immediate stimulus to exact revenge derives from a perceived injury or loss. This injury or loss may take physical form, as in the death of kin or personal injury, but may also take non-physical form, as in the loss of or damage to personal reputation or social standing. Thus, the death of Isenhart leads to the *zorn* of his relatives, whilst the death of Cidegast and the wounding of Anfortas prompt the *zorn* of Orgeluse. Nevertheless, *zorn* deriving from loss of *êre* seems to be more common: Hardiz, Lähelin, Orilus, Ither, and Meljanz all illustrate this point.

Wolfram does not stop at identifying the immediate cause of *zorn*, however. Instead, he shows how wider issues are at stake. Two principal root causes of *zorn* are identifiable in *Parzival*: *minne* and reputation in the field of combat. Love (*minne*) is a catalyst in the loss of Isenhart, the wrangle between Kaylet and Hardiz, Orilus's *zorn* towards Jeschute, Clamide's attack on Belrepeire, Meljanz's rift with Obie and Lyppaut, Orgeluse's reaction to the death of Cidegast and wounding of Anfortas, and even in Urjans's rape of the unnamed female messenger, if Gawan is to be believed (528,3f.). Reputation for prowess is the primary motivating factor for Lähelin's *zorn* at Kanvoleis (79,13f.) and Ither's *zorn* towards Parzival, but it also influences the behaviour of Orilus, who views Jeschute's apparent disgrace as a simultaneous affront to his 'rîterlîcher prîs' (133,9f.).

Wolfram also shows how concern for personal reputation on the battlefield can then contribute to the perpetuation and deepening of *zorn*. This is most obvious at Bearosche (349,1-6).

Once in the field, the knight hopes to distinguish himself, and the question of personal honour and reputation automatically arises. There is thus a tendency for violent conduct to become self-perpetuating. Wolfram shows how the death of one man, such

as Isenhart, can lead to war on a grand scale. Within that conflict, fresh *zorn* is engendered as Lähelin feels motivated to defend his honour, only to suffer the 'smæhlîchen pîn' (79,26) of defeat by Gahmuret. This, in turn, may have motivated Lähelin to overrun Gahmuret's lands and Orilus to kill Schionatulander. In a parallel case, the Baruc's seizure of Niniveh prompts a violent reaction from Pompeius and Ipomidon. Gahmuret's subsequent defeat of Ipomidon then leads the latter to seek Gahmuret's own death. These examples can easily be multiplied. Perhaps most striking is the consequence of Orgeluse's *zorn* after Cidegast's death: the wounding of Anfortas occurs in her service, thus precipitating the crisis at the Grail Castle.

However, Wolfram examines not only the physical but also the moral consequences of succumbing to *zorn*. Parzival's failure to control his *zorn* when confronted by the *redespæher man* at the Grail Castle foreshadows his failure to ask the question. This, in turn, prompts the anger of Sigune and Cundrie la surziere, which then leads directly to Parzival's anger towards God. Cain and Lucifer exemplify the fate of those who take this path: Trevrizent's skilful counselling plays a crucial role in diverting Parzival from a route that leads to eternal damnation. In this context, there can be little doubt that *zorn* is a sin deriving from Parzival's *hôchvart*, entirely in keeping with contemporary theological thought.

In spite of Wolfram's broader examination of *zorn*, there are nevertheless many points of comparison between the portrayal of *zorn* in *Parzival* and in Hartmann's Arthurian romances. Like Hartmann, Wolfram uses *zorn* to signal a break in social relations, as when Amplise's envoys react to the news that Gahmuret rejects her offer of marriage. Similarly, *zorn* can simply signify *furor heroicus*, as when the *templeis* prepares to fight Parzival. It should be noted, however, that *zorn* is conspicuous by its absence from the Schanpfanzen episode in *Parzival*.

Animal symbolism associated with *zorn* is found in *Iwein* and *Parzival*, but is notably absent in *Erec*. Both make reference to the traditional anger of lions. The *zorn* of Iwein's lion effectively symbolizes both the savage *furor heroicus* necessary to redress the balance when faced with forces of evil that are superior in size and/or number, and the authority of good over evil. The lion that faces Gawan in *Parzival* is an aspect of the diabolical quality of the Lit marveile ordeal, but also symbolizes *furor heroicus* (testing Gawan's own *fortitudo*), as well as symbolizing the trials and tribulations of love. Finally, the comparison of Parzival and Feirefiz to lions emphasizes

both their blood relationship and their common predisposition to exemplary *furor heroicus*. In *Iwein*, both the dog and the wolf are also associated with anger, whilst in *Parzival* reference is made to the ostrich and to the hedgehog in contexts where anger is present. It should be noted, however, that in his description of Lahfilrost's anger, Wolfram makes use of such imagery to comic effect.

Like Hartmann, Wolfram also shows anger having a corrective purpose, as when Kaylet warns Gahmuret against sinking into a state of *tristitia* over his brother's death. However, this is also an area where both authors see potential problems: Keie's correction of Cunneware in *Parzival* and Ginover's correction of Kei in *Iwein*, as well as Laudine's correction of Iwein himself, are all shown to be problematical. In *Iwein*, this is part of a more general problematization of traditional wisdom associated with anger. Both authors also see a conflict between *zorn* and *zuht*, particularly where the anger of women is concerned — one has only to think of Ginover in *Iwein* or Cundrie la surziere in *Parzival*. This opposition of *zuht* to *zorn* perhaps reflects what has been described as 'a literary commonplace' in MHG literature (Hyams 1998: 113).

Wolfram dwells on the diabolical associations of anger rather more than Hartmann, although both authors portray *zorn* as a characteristic of giants and other extra-courtly figures, such as the wild man in *Iwein*. Wolfram is also far more interested in the association of anger with love and with impatience. However, Hartmann and Wolfram seem to be unanimous in seeing a need to control anger, to be slow to anger, and to avoid letting the sun go down on one's anger. In this they follow well-known precepts laid down in the Bible. Wolfram's Keie is perhaps the clearest example of a man whose otherwise laudable qualities and important responsibilities are compromised by a choleric temperament.

It is in keeping with the narrower focus of Hartmann's portrayal of *zorn* that he portrays the chief remedy to it as being the personal *güete* of the individual, making Enite, Erec and Gawein exemplary in this respect. Wolfram does not ignore the value of personal virtue, concentrating particularly on the equanimity with which Gawan quite literally deals with the slings and arrows of outrageous fortune. However, the deeper causes and wider consequences of *zorn* in *Parzival* require more than a fundamentally good nature or a patient disposition. In order to combat *zorn*, it is necessary to exercise not only *patientia*, but also reflection, moderation and discretion. Above all, it is necessary to strive constantly to achieve *suone*, using all the diplomatic skills and

means of persuasion available. This involves not only the resolution of one's own problems but also active intervention in the problems of others, as exemplified by Artus's great 'suone teidinc' (729,5). As the narrator comments: 'swer prüvet daz für kleiniu dinc, / der grøeze swaz er welle' (729,6f.).

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### Primary Sources and Translations

(Unless otherwise indicated, quotations from and references to the texts relate to the editions marked †)

#### *Aliscans*

- † Holtus. *La versione franco-italiana della 'Bataille d'Aliscans': Codex Marcianus fr. VIII [=252]*, ed. Günter Holtus, Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie, 205 (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1985)

#### Andreas Capellanus, *De amore*

- Parry (trans.). *The Art of Courtly Love by Andreas Capellanus*, trans. John Jay Parry (New York: Ungar, 1959)
- † Walsh. *Andreas Capellanus on Love*, ed. and trans. P. G. Walsh, Duckworth Classical, Medieval and Renaissance Editions (London: Duckworth, 1982)

#### Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*

- † Ross (trans.). *Aristotle: The Nicomachean Ethics*, trans. David Ross, rev. J. L. Ackrill and J. O. Urmson, Oxford World's Classics (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1980; repr. 1998)

#### Bernardus Silvestris, *Commentary on the First Six Books of Virgil's 'Aeneid' (Commentum)*

- † Jones and Jones. *The Commentary on the First Six Books of the 'Aeneid' of Vergil Commonly Attributed to Bernardus Silvestris*, ed. Julian Ward Jones and Elizabeth Frances Jones (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1977)
- Schreiber and Maresca (trans.). *Commentary on the First Six Books of Virgil's 'Aeneid' by Bernardus Silvestris*, trans. Earl G. Schreiber and Thomas E. Maresca (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1979)

#### Boethius, *De consolazione philosophiae*

- † Moreschini. *Boethius: De consolazione philosophiae. Opuscula theologica*, ed. Claudio Moreschini, Bibliotheca Teubneriana (Munich: Saur, 2000)
- Watts (trans.). *Boethius: The Consolation of Philosophy*, trans. V. E. Watts, Penguin Classics (London: Penguin, 1969)

#### John Cassian, *Conlationes seniorum*

- † Pichery. *Jean Cassien: Conférences*, ed. and trans. Dom. E Pichery, Sources Chrétiennes, 42, 54 & 64, 3 vols (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1955-59)

#### John Cassian, *De institutiis coenobiorum et de octo principalium vitiorum remediis*

- † Guy. *Jean Cassien: Institutions Cénobitiques*, ed. and trans. Jean-Claude Guy, Sources Chrétiennes, 109 (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1965)

#### *Der deutsche Cato (Cato)*

† Zarncke. *Der deutsche Cato: Geschichte der deutschen Übersetzungen der im Mittelalter unter dem Namen Cato bekannten Distichen bis zur Verdrängung derselben durch die Übersetzung Seb. Brants am Ende des 15. Jahrhunderts*, ed. Fr. Zarncke (Leipzig: Wigand, 1852)

Catullus, *Poems*

† Thomson. *Catullus*, ed. D. F. S. Thomson, Phoenix Supplementary Volume, 34 (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1997)

Chrétien de Troyes, *Erec et Enide* (EE.)

Owen (trans.). *Chrétien de Troyes: Arthurian Romances*, trans. D. D. R. Owen, Everyman Classic (London: Dent, 1987; repr. 1991), pp. 1-92; 499-505

† Roques. *Les Romans de Chrétien de Troyes, édités d'après la copie de Guiot (Bibl. nat., fr. 794)*, I: *Erec et Enide*, ed. Mario Roques, Les classiques français du Moyen Age, 80 (Paris: Champion, 1981)

Chrétien de Troyes, *Le Conte du Graal* (*Perceval*)

† Busby. *Chrétien de Troyes: Le Roman de Perceval ou Le Conte du Graal*, ed. Keith Busby (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1993)

Owen (trans.). *Chrétien de Troyes: Arthurian Romances*, trans. D. D. R. Owen, Everyman Classic (London: Dent, 1987; repr. 1991), pp. 374-495; 521-26

Chrétien de Troyes, *Yvain*

Owen (trans.). *Chrétien de Troyes: Arthurian Romances*, trans. D. D. R. Owen, Everyman Classic (London: Dent, 1987; repr. 1991), pp. 281-373; 515-20

† Reid. *Chrestien de Troyes: Yvain (Le chevalier au lion)*, ed. Wendelin Foerster, rev. T. B. W. Reid, French Classics (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1942)

*Disticha Catonis*

† Boas. *Disticha Catonis*, ed. Marcus Boas (Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing Company, 1952)

Richard Edwards, *Amantium irae amoris redintegratio est*

† Bradner. Bradner, Leicester, *The Life and Poems of Richard Edwards*, Yale Studies in English, 74 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1927), pp. 120f.

Eilhart von Oberg, *Tristrant*

† Buschinger. *Eilhart von Oberg: Tristrant*, ed. and trans. Danielle Buschinger, Göppinger Arbeiten zur Germanistik, 202 (Göppingen: Kümmerle, 1976)

*Etymachia*

† Harris. *The Latin and German »Etymachia«: Textual History, Edition, Commentary*, ed. Nigel Harris, Münchener Texte und Untersuchungen zur deutschen Literatur des Mittelalters, 102 (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1994)

*Fasciculus morum*

† Wenzel. *Fasciculus morum: A Fourteenth-Century Preachers Handbook*, ed. and trans. Siegfried Wenzel (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1989)

Freidank, *Bescheidenheit*

† Bezzenberger. *Fridankes Bescheidenheit*, ed. H. E. Bezzenberger (Halle: Verlag der Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses, 1872)

Spiewok (trans.). *Freidanks Bescheidenheit: Auswahl mittelhochdeutsch-neuhochdeutsch*, ed. H. E. Bezzenberger, trans. Wolfgang Spiewok, Reclam-Bibliothek, 1105, 2nd edn (Leipzig: Reclam, 1991)

Giraldus Cambrensis, *Itinerarium Kambriae*

† Dimock. *Giraldi Cambrensis Opera*, VI: *Itinerarium Kambriae et Descriptio Kambriae*, ed. James F. Dimock, *Rerum Britannicarum Medii Aevi Scriptores*, 21 (London: Longmans, Green, Reader, and Dyer, 1868), pp. 1-152

Gottfried von Straßburg, *Tristan*

Hatto (trans.). *Gottfried von Strassburg: Tristan, with the Surviving Fragments of the 'Tristan' of Thomas*, trans. A. T. Hatto, Penguin Classics (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1960; repr. 1974)

† Krohn (trans.). *Gottfried von Straßburg: Tristan*, ed. Friedrich Ranke, trans. Rüdiger Krohn, Universal-Bibliothek, 4471-3, 5th edn, 3 vols (Stuttgart: Reclam, 1990)

Gregory the Great, *Moralia in Iob*

† Adriaen. *S. Gregorii Magni Moralia in Iob*, ed. Marcus Adriaen, *Corpus Christianorum: Series Latina*, 143, 3 vols (Turnholt: Brepols, 1979-85)

Hartmann von Aue, *Der arme Heinrich* (A. Heinr.)

† Bonath. *Hartmann von Aue: Der arme Heinrich*, ed. Hermann Paul, rev. Gesa Bonath, *Altdeutsche Textbibliothek*, 3, 15th edn (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1984)

Hartmann von Aue, *Erec*

† Cormeau/Gärtner. *Erec von Hartmann von Aue*, ed. Albert Leitzmann and Ludwig Wolff, rev. Christoph Cormeau and Kurt Gärtner, *Altdeutsche Textbibliothek*, 39, 6th edn (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1985)

Cramer (trans.). *Hartmann von Aue: Erec*, ed. Albert Leitzmann and Ludwig Wolff, trans. Thomas Cramer (Frankfurt am Main: Fischer, 1972; repr. 1987)

Keller (trans.). *Hartmann von Aue: Erec*, trans. Thomas L. Keller, *Garland Library of Medieval Literature, Series B*, 12 (New York: Garland, 1987)

Resler (trans.). *Erec by Hartmann von Aue*, trans. Michael Resler, *Middle Ages Series* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1987)

Thomas (trans.). *Erec by Hartmann von Aue*, trans. J. W. Thomas (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1982)

Vivian (trans.). *Arthurian Romances, Tales, and Lyric Poetry: The Complete Works of Hartmann von Aue*, trans. Frank Tobin, Kim Vivian, Richard H. Lawson (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2001), pp. 51-163

Hartmann von Aue, *Gregorius*

† Wachinger. *Gregorius von Hartmann von Aue*, ed. Hermann Paul, rev. Burghart Wachinger, *Altdeutsche Textbibliothek*, 2, 14th edn (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1992)

Hartmann von Aue, *Iwein*

Cramer (trans.). *Hartmann von Aue: Iwein*, ed. G. F. Benecke and K. Lachmann, rev. L. Wolff, trans. Thomas Cramer, 3rd edn (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1981)

Lawson (trans.). *Arthurian Romances, Tales, and Lyric Poetry: The Complete Works of Hartmann von Aue*, trans. Frank Tobin, Kim Vivian, Richard H. Lawson (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2001), pp. 235-321

McConeghy. *Hartmann von Aue: Iwein*, ed. and trans. Patrick M. McConeghy, Garland Library of Medieval Literature, 19 (New York: Garland, 1984)

Thomas (trans.). *Iwein by Hartmann von Aue*, trans. J. W. Thomas (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1979)

† Wolff. *Iwein: Eine Erzählung von Hartmann von Aue*, ed. G. F. Benecke and K. Lachmann, rev. Ludwig Wolff, 7th edn, 2 vols (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1968)

Hartmann von Aue, *Klagebüchlein*

† Wolff. *Das Klagebüchlein Hartmanns von Aue und das zweite Büchlein*, ed. Ludwig Wolff, Altdeutsche Texte in kritischen Ausgaben, 4 (Munich: Fink, 1972)

Heinrich von Veldeke, *Eneasroman* (En.)

† Kartschoke (trans.). *Heinrich von Veldeke: Eneasroman, mittelhochdeutsch/neuhochdeutsch*, ed. Ludwig Ettmüller, trans. Dieter Kartschoke, Universal-Bibliothek, 8303 (Stuttgart: Reclam, 1986)

Hugh of Fouilloy: *Aviarium*

† Clark. *The Medieval Book of Birds: Hugh of Fouilloy's Aviarium*, ed. and trans. Willene B. Clark, Medieval & Renaissance Texts & Studies, 80 (Binghamton, NY: Center for Medieval and Early Renaissance Studies, 1992)

*Ívens saga*

† Blaisdell. *Ívens saga*, ed. and trans. Foster W. Blaisdell, Editiones Arnarnagæanæ, Series B, 18 (Copenhagen: Reitzel, 1979)

Blaisdell and Kalinke (trans.). *Erex Saga and Ívens Saga: The Old Norse Versions of Chrétien de Troyes's 'Erec' and 'Yvain'*, trans. Foster W. Blaisdell, Jr and Marianne E. Kalinke (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1977), pp. 35-83

Johannes de Hauvilla, *Architrenius*

† Wetherbee. *Johannes de Hauvilla: Architrenius*, ed. and trans. Winthrop Wetherbee, Cambridge Medieval Classics, 3 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994)

John of Salisbury, *Policraticus*

† Keats-Rohan. *Ioannis Saresberiensis Policraticus I-IV*, ed. K. S. B. Keats-Rohan, Corpus Christianorum Continuatio Mediaevalis, 118 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1993)

Nederman (trans.). *John of Salisbury: Policraticus. Of the Frivolities of Courtiers and the Footprints of Philosophers*, ed. and trans. Cary J. Nederman, Cambridge Texts in the History of Political Thought (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990)

Konrad von Megenberg, *Das Buch der Natur*



† Pfeiffer. *Das Buch der Natur von Konrad von Megenberg: Die erste Naturgeschichte in deutscher Sprache*, ed. Franz Pfeiffer (Stuttgart: Aue, 1861)

Konrad von Würzburg, *Heinrich von Kempten*

† Schröder. *Kleinere Dichtungen Konrads von Würzburg*, ed. Edward Schröder, I: *Der Welt Lohn, Das Herzmaere, Heinrich von Kempten*, 2nd edn (Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1930), pp. 41-68

Koran

† Ali. *The Holy Qur'an*, ed. and trans. Abdullah Yusuf Ali, rev. edn (Brentwood, Md.: Amana Corporation, 1989)

Lucan: *Bellum civile*

Braund (trans.). *Lucan: Civil War*, trans. Susan H. Braund, The World's Classics (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992)

† Marti. *Arnulfi Aurelianusensis glosule super Lucanum*, ed. Berthe M. Marti, Papers and Monographs of the American Academy in Rome, 18 (Rome: American Academy, 1958)

† Shackleton-Bailey. *M. Annaei Lucani De bello civili libri X*, ed. D. R. Shackleton-Bailey, Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana, 2nd edn (Stuttgart: Teubner, 1997)

Walter Map, *De nugis curialium*

† Brooke/Mynors. *Walter Map: De nugis curialium. Courtiers' Trifles*, ed. and trans. M. R. James, rev. C. N. L. Brooke and R. A. B. Mynors, Oxford Medieval Texts (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983)

Millstätter *Reimphysiologus*

† Maurer. *Der altdeutsche Physiologus: Die Millstätter Reimfassung und die Wiener Prosa (nebst dem lateinischen Text und dem althochdeutschen Physiologus)*, ed. Friedrich Maurer, Altdeutsche Textbibliothek, 67 (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1967)

Penitentials

† Bieler. *The Irish Penitentials*, ed. Ludwig Bieler, Scriptores Latini Hiberniae, 5 (Dublin: The Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies, 1963)

† McNeill and Gamer. *Medieval Handbooks of Penance: A Translation of the Principal 'libri poenitentiales' and Selections from Related Documents*, ed. John T. McNeill and Helena M. Gamer, Records of Civilization: Sources and Studies, 29 (New York: Columbia University Press, 1938)

*Piramus et Tisbé*

† Boer. *Piramus et Tisbé: Poème du XIIe siècle*, ed. C. de Boer, Les classiques français du Moyen Age, 26 (Paris: Champion, 1965)

Plato, *Laws*

† Saunders (trans.). *Plato: Complete Works*, ed. John M. Cooper, trans. Trevor J. Saunders (Indianapolis: Hackett, 1997), pp. 1318-616

Plato, *Phaedo*

- † Grube (trans.). *Plato: Complete Works*, ed. John M. Cooper, trans. G. M. A. Grube (Indianapolis: Hackett, 1997), pp. 49-100

Prudentius, *Psychomachia*

- † Burton. *Prudentius: Psychomachia*, ed. Rosemary Burton, Bryn Mawr Latin Commentaries, 2 vols (Bryn Mawr, PA: Thomas Library, Bryn Mawr College, 1989)

Reinmar von Zweter, *Gedichte*

- † Roethe. *Die Gedichte Reinmars von Zweter*, ed. Gustav Roethe (Leipzig: Hirzel, 1887; repr. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1967)

*Rolandslied (RL)*

- † Wesle. *Das Rolandslied des Pfaffen Konrad*, ed. Carl Wesle, rev. Peter Wapnewski, Altdeutsche Textbibliothek, 69, 2nd edn (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1967)

*Roman d'Eneas (RdE.)*

- † Salverda de Grave. *Eneas: Roman du XIIIe siècle*, ed. J.-J. Salverda de Grave, Les classiques français du Moyen Age, 44 and 62, 2 vols (Paris: Champion, 1985-1983)

Yunck (trans.). *Eneas: A Twelfth-Century Romance*, trans. John A. Yunck, Records of Civilization: Sources and Studies, 93 (New York: Columbia University Press, 1974)

Hans Sachs, *Die zwölf unreynen vögel, darinn die art der gotlosen gebildet ist*

- † Keller. *Hans Sachs*, ed. Adelbert von Keller, Bibliothek des Literarischen Vereins in Stuttgart, 102, I (Tübingen: Laupp, 1870; repr. Hildesheim: Olms, 1964), pp. 380-82

*Ruodlieb*

- † Vollmann. *Ruodlieb: Faksimile-Ausgabe des Codex Latinus Monacensis 19486 der bayerischen Staatsbibliothek München und der Fragmente von St. Florian*, ed. Benedikt Konrad Vollmann, 3 vols (Wiesbaden: Reichert, 1974-)

*Straßburger Alexander (Str. Alex.)*

- † Kinzel. *Lamprechts Alexander nach den drei Texten mit dem Fragment des Alberic von Besançon und den lateinischen Quellen*, ed. Karl Kinzel, Germanistische Handbibliothek, 6 (Halle a. S.: Verlag der Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses, 1884)

Tacitus, *Germania*

- † Benario (trans.). *Tacitus: Germany (Germania)*, ed. M. Winterbottom and R. M. Ogilvie, trans. Herbert W. Benario (Warminster: Aris & Phillips, 1999)

Terence, *Andria*

Bovie (trans.). *Terence: The Comedies*, trans. Palmer Bovie, Constance Carrier, Douglass Parker, Complete Roman Drama in Translation (Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press, 1992), pp. 3-70

- † Shipp. *P. Terenti Afri Andria*, ed. G. P. Shipp, 2nd edn (Melbourne: Oxford University Press, 1960)

Terence, *Eunuchus*

- † Barsby. *Terence: Eunuchus*, ed. John Barsby, Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999)

- Parker (trans.). *Terence: The Comedies*, trans. Palmer Bovie, Constance Carrier, Douglass Parker, Complete Roman Drama in Translation (Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press, 1992), pp. 145-226
- Terence, *Heautontimorumenos*
- Bovie (trans.). *Terence: The Comedies*, trans. Palmer Bovie, Constance Carrier, Douglass Parker, Complete Roman Drama in Translation (Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press, 1992), pp. 71-144
- † Brothers. *Terence: The Self-Tormentor*, ed. and trans. A. J. Brothers (Warminster: Aris & Phillips, 1988)
- Thomasin von Zerclaere, *Der Welsche Gast* (DWG)
- Kries. *Thomasin von Zerclaere: Der Welsche Gast*, ed. F. W. von Kries, Göppinger Arbeiten zur Germanistik, 425, 4 vols (Göppingen: Kümmerle, 1984-85)
- † Rückert. *Der Wälsche Gast des Thomasin von Zirclaria*, ed. Heinrich Rückert, Deutsche Neudrucke, Reihe: Texte des Mittelalters (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1965)
- Ulrich von Zatzikhoven, *Lanzelet*
- † Hahn. *Ulrich von Zatzikhoven: Lanzelet. Eine Erzählung*, ed. K. A. Hahn, Deutsche Neudrucke: Texte des Mittelalters (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1965)
- Webster (trans.). *Ulrich von Zatzikhoven: Lanzelet. A Romance of Lancelot*, trans. Kenneth G. T. Webster, rev. Roger Sherman Loomis, Records of Civilization, Sources and Studies, 47 (New York: Columbia University Press, 1951)
- Johannes Veghe, *Wyngaerden der sele*
- † Rademacher. *Wyngaerden der sele: Eine aszetisch-mystische Schrift aus dem 15. Jahrhundert, Niederdeutsch von Johannes Veghe, Fraterherr in Münster*, ed. Heinrich Rademacher (Hiltrup: Herz-Jesu Missionshaus, 1940)
- Virgil, *Aeneid* (*Aen.*)
- † Williams. *The Aeneid of Virgil*, ed. R. D. Williams, 2 vols (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1972-73)
- Vulgate Bible
- † Weber. *Biblia Sacra iuxta vulgatam versionem*, ed. Robert Weber, 2 vols (Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1969)
- Walther von der Vogelweide, *Lieder*
- † Cormeau. *Walther von der Vogelweide: Leich, Lieder, Sangsprüche*, ed. Christoph Cormeau, 14th edn (völlig neu bearbeitete Auflage der Ausgabe Karl Lachmanns mit Beiträgen von Thomas Bein und Horst Brunner) (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1996)
- Wilmanns. *Walther von der Vogelweide, II: Lieder und Sprüche Walthers von der Vogelweide mit erklärenden Anmerkungen*, ed. W. Wilmanns, Germanistische Handbibliothek, 1,2, 4th edn (besorgt von Victor Michels) (Halle: Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses, 1924)
- Wolfram von Eschenbach, *Parzival* (*Pz.*)

- Bartsch/Marti. *Wolframs von Eschenbach Parzival und Titurel*, ed. Karl Bartsch, rev. Marta Marti, Deutsche Klassiker des Mittelalters, 9-11, 4th edn, 3 vols (Leipzig: Brockhaus, 1927-32)
- Hatto (trans.). *Wolfram von Eschenbach: Parzival*, trans. A. T. Hatto, Penguin Classics (London: Penguin, 1980)
- Lachmann. *Wolfram von Eschenbach: Parzival*, ed. Karl Lachmann, 6th edn, Studienausgabe (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1965)
- Nellmann. *Wolfram von Eschenbach: Parzival*, ed. Karl Lachmann, rev. Eberhard Nellmann, trans. Dieter Kühn, Bibliothek des Mittelalters, 8, 2 vols (Frankfurt am Main: Deutscher Klassiker Verlag, 1994)
- † Schiroke. *Wolfram von Eschenbach: Parzival*, ed. Karl Lachmann, rev. Bernd Schiroke, trans. Peter Knecht, Studienausgabe (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1998)
- Wolfram von Eschenbach, *Willehalm*
- Gibbs and Johnson (trans.). *Wolfram von Eschenbach: Willehalm*, trans. Marion E. Gibbs and Sidney M. Johnson, Penguin Classics (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1984)
- † Heinze. *Wolfram von Eschenbach: Willehalm. Nach der Handschrift 857 der Stiftsbibliothek St Gallen. Mittelhochdeutscher Text, Übersetzung, Kommentar, mit den Miniaturen aus der Wolfenbütteler Handschrift und einem Aufsatz von Peter und Dorothea Diemer*, ed. Joachim Heinze, Bibliothek des Mittelalters, 9 (Frankfurt am Main: Deutscher Klassiker Verlag, 1991)
- Kartschoke (trans.). *Wolfram von Eschenbach: Willehalm*, ed. Werner Schröder, trans. Dieter Kartschoke (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1989)

#### Other Works Cited

- Althoff, Gerd 1998. 'Ira Regis: Prolegomena to a History of Royal Anger', in *Anger's Past: The Social Uses of an Emotion in the Middle Ages*, ed. Barbara H. Rosenwein (Ithaca: Cornell University Press), pp. 59-74
- Arnold, Benjamin 1985. *German Knighthood 1050 - 1300* (Oxford: Clarendon Press)
- 1991. *Princes and Territories in Medieval Germany* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)
- Bächtold-Stäubli, Hanns (ed.) 1927-42. *Handwörterbuch des deutschen Aberglaubens*, Handwörterbücher zur deutschen Volkskunde, Abteilung 1: Aberglaube, 10 vols (Berlin: de Gruyter)
- Bartlett, Robert 1994. 'Symbolic Meanings of Hair in the Middle Ages', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 6, 4: 43-60
- 1998. 'Mortal Enmities': *The Legal Aspect of Hostility in the Middle Ages*, T Jones Pierce Lecture (Aberystwyth: University of Wales)
- Barton, Richard E. 1998. "'Zealous Anger" and the Renegotiation of Aristocratic Relationships in Eleventh- and Twelfth-Century France', in *Anger's Past: The Social Uses of an Emotion in the Middle Ages*, ed. Barbara H. Rosenwein (Ithaca: Cornell University Press), pp. 153-70

- Baum, Paull Franklin 1922. 'Judas's Red Hair', *Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, 21: 520-29
- Benecke/Müller/Zarncke 1854-61. *Mittelhochdeutsches Wörterbuch*, ed. Georg Friedrich Benecke, Wilhelm Müller and Friedrich Zarncke, 3 vols (Leipzig: Hirzel)
- Bertau, Karl 1983. 'Regina lactans: Versuch über den dichterischen Ursprung der Pietà bei Wolfram von Eschenbach', in *Wolfram von Eschenbach: Neun Versuche über Subjektivität und Ursprünglichkeit in der Geschichte*, by Karl Bertau (Munich: Beck), pp. 259-85
- Blamires, David 1966. *Characterization and Individuality in Wolfram's 'Parzival'* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)
- Blank, Walter 1998. 'Der Melancholiker als Romanheld: Zum deutschen *Prosa-Lancelot*, Hartmanns *Iwein* und Wolframs *Parzival*', in *Ist mir getroumet mîn leben? Vom Träumen und vom Anderssein: Festschrift für Karl-Ernst Geith zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. André Schnyder and others, *Göppinger Arbeiten zur Germanistik*, 632 (Göppingen: Kümmerle), pp. 1-19
- Bloomfield, Morton W. 1952. *The Seven Deadly Sins: An Introduction to the History of a Religious Concept, with Special Reference to Medieval English Literature*, *Studies in Language and Literature* (Michigan: Michigan State College Press)
- Blosen, Hans 1976. 'Noch einmal: Zu Enites Schuld in Hartmanns *Erec*. Mit Ausblicken auf Chrétien's Roman und das Mabinogi von *Gereint*', *Orbis Litterarum*, 31: 81-109
- 1978. 'Hartmanns *Erec* als eifersüchtiger Ehemann: Nachtragsnotiz zu meinem Aufsatz: Noch einmal: Zu Enites Schuld in Hartmanns *Erec*, *Orbis Litterarum* 31 (1976) S. 81-109', *Orbis Litterarum*, 33: 1-3
- Boggs, R. A. 1979. *Hartmann von Aue: Lemmatisierte Konkordanz zum Gesamtwerk*, *Indices zur deutschen Literatur*, 12/13 (Nendeln, Liechtenstein: KTO Press)
- Borck, Karl Heinz 1978. 'Adel, Tugend und Geblüt: Thesen und Beobachtungen zur Vorstellung des Tugendadels in der deutschen Literatur des 12. und 13. Jahrhunderts', *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur (Tübingen)*, 100: 423-57
- Braut, Gerard J. 1997. *Early Blazon: Heraldic Terminology in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries with Special Reference to Arthurian Heraldry*, 2nd edn (Woodbridge: Boydell)
- Brodeur, Arthur Gilchrist 1924. 'The Grateful Lion: A Study in the Development of Medieval Narrative', *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*, 39: 485-524
- Brüggen, Elke 1989. *Kleidung und Mode in der höfischen Epik des 12. und 13. Jahrhunderts*, Beihefte zum *Euphorion*, 23 (Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag)
- Bumke, Joachim 1977. *Studien zum Ritterbegriff im 12. und 13. Jahrhundert*, 2nd edn mit einem Anhang: *Zum Stand der Ritterforschung 1976*, Beihefte zum *Euphorion*, 1 (Heidelberg: Winter)

- 1986. *Höfische Kultur: Literatur und Gesellschaft im hohen Mittelalter*, 6th edn, 2 vols (Munich: Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag; repr. 1992)
- 1991. *Wolfram von Eschenbach*, Sammlung Metzler, 36, 6th edn (Stuttgart: Metzler)
- 1992. 'Höfische Kultur: Versuch einer kritischen Bestandsaufnahme', *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur* (Tübingen), 114: 414-92
- 1994. 'Geschlechterbeziehungen in den Gawanbüchern von Wolframs *Parzival*', *Amsterdamer Beiträge zur älteren Germanistik*, 38/39: 105-21
- Burrow, J. A. 1986. *The Ages of Man: A Study in Medieval Writing and Thought* (Oxford: Clarendon Press)
- Busby, Keith 1980. *Gauvain in Old French Literature*, Degré Second, 2 (Amsterdam: Rodopi)
- 1983. 'The Likes of Dinadan: The Rôle of the Misfit in Arthurian Literature', *Neophilologus*, 67: 161-74
- Cameron, Keith. 1976. 'Panurge and the Screech-Owl: An Interpretation of Rabelais, Le Tiers Livre, Ch. XIV', *Neophilologische Mitteilungen*, 77: 161-65
- Campbell, Ian R. 1980. 'The Nature of Erec's Marital Problems in Hartmann's *Erec*', in *AULLA XX: Proceedings and Papers of the Twentieth Congress of the Australasian Universities Language and Literature Association, University of Newcastle, New South Wales, 30 January-5 February 1980*, ed. David L. Frost, I [AULLA], pp. 204-08
- Canby, Sheila R. 1995. 'Dragons', in *Mythical Beasts*, ed. John Cherry (London: British Museum Press), pp. 14-43
- Carne, Eva-Marie 1970. *Die Frauengestalten bei Hartmann von Aue: Ihre Bedeutung im Aufbau und Gehalt der Epen*, Marburger Beiträge zur Germanistik, 31 (Marburg: Elwert)
- Cary, George 1956. *The Medieval Alexander*, ed. D. J. A. Ross (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)
- Cathey, James E. 1983. 'Berserks', in *Dictionary of the Middle Ages*, ed. Joseph R. Strayer and others (New York: Scribner, 1982-89), II: 198
- Chance, Jane 1994. *Medieval Mythography: from Roman North Africa to the School of Chartres, A.D. 433-1177* (Gainesville: University Press of Florida)
- Christoph, Siegfried Richard 1981. *Wolfram von Eschenbach's Couples*, Amsterdamer Publikationen zur Sprache und Literatur, 44 (Amsterdam: Rodopi)
- 1989. 'Guenevere's Abduction and Arthur's Fame in Hartmann's *Iwein*', *Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum und deutsche Literatur*, 118: 17-33
- Classen, Albrecht 1988. 'Keie in Wolframs von Eschenbach *Parzival*: "Agent Provocateur" oder Angeber?', *Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, 87: 382-405
- Clifford, Richard J. and Roland E. Murphy 1989. 'Genesis', in *The New Jerome Biblical Commentary*, ed. Raymond E. Brown, Joseph A. Fitzmyer, and Roland E. Murphy (London: Chapman), pp. 8-43

- Cormeau, Christoph 1995. 'Thomasin von Zerklære' in *Die deutsche Literatur des Mittelalters: Verfasserlexikon*, ed. Burghart Wachinger and others, 2nd edn, 11 vols (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1978-), IX: cols. 896-902
- Cormeau, Christoph and Wilhelm Störmer 1993. *Hartmann von Aue: Epoche-Werk-Wirkung*, Arbeitsbücher zur Literaturgeschichte, 2nd edn (Munich: Beck)
- Cramer, Thomas 1972. 'Soziale Motivation in der Schuld-Sühne-Problematik von Hartmanns *Erec*', *Euphorion*, 66: 97-112
- Dallapiazza, Michael 1996. 'Plippalinots Tochter', *Prospero*, 3: 85-95
- Davidson, William L. 1908. 'Anger (Psychological and Ethical)', in *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*, ed. James Hastings, 13 vols (Edinburgh: Clark, 1908-26), I: 475-77
- Davies, Wendy 1998. 'Anger and the Celtic Saint', in *Anger's Past: The Social Uses of an Emotion in the Middle Ages*, ed. Barbara H. Rosenwein (Ithaca: Cornell University Press), pp. 191-202
- Decke-Cornill, Renate 1985. *Stellenkommentar zum III. Buch des 'Willehalm' Wolframs von Eschenbach*, Marburger Studien zur Germanistik, 7 (Marburg: Elwert)
- Delabar, Walter 1990. *Erkantiu sippe unt hoch geselleschaft: Studien zur Funktion des Verwandtschaftsverbandes in Wolframs von Eschenbach 'Parzival'*, Göppinger Arbeiten zur Germanistik, 518 (Göppingen: Kümmerle)
- Dicke, Gerd and Klaus Grubmüller 1987. *Die Fabeln des Mittelalters und der frühen Neuzeit: Ein Katalog der deutschen Versionen und ihrer lateinischen Entsprechungen*, Münstersche Mittelalter-Schriften, 60 (Munich: Fink)
- Dittrich, Marie-Luise 1966. *Die 'Eneide' Heinrichs von Veldeke*, I: *Quellenkritischer Vergleich mit dem 'Roman d'Eneas' und Vergils 'Aeneis'* (Wiesbaden: Steiner)
- Draesner, Ulrike 1993. *Wege durch erzählte Welten: Intertextuelle Verweise als Mittel der Bedeutungskonstitution in Wolframs 'Parzival'*, Mikrokosmos, 36 (Frankfurt am Main: Lang)
- Duckworth, David 1980. *The Influence of Biblical Terminology and Thought on Wolfram's 'Parzival' with Special Reference to the Epistle of St James and the Concept of 'zwîvel'*, Göppinger Arbeiten zur Germanistik, 273 (Göppingen: Kümmerle)
- 1985. *Gregorius: A Medieval Man's Discovery of His True Self*, Göppinger Arbeiten zur Germanistik, 422 (Göppingen: Kümmerle)
- Dutripon, F. P. (ed.) 1868. *Vulgatae Editionis Bibliorum Sacrorum Concordantiae*, 2nd edn (Paris: Barri-Ducis)
- DWb. 1854-1954. *Deutsches Wörterbuch*, ed. Jacob and Wilhelm Grimm, 16 vols (Leipzig: Hirzel)
- Eichholz, Birgit 1987. *Kommentar zur Sigune- und Ither-Szene im 3. Buch von Wolframs 'Parzival'*, Helfant Studien, S 3 (Stuttgart: Helfant Edition)
- Eifler, Günter 1969. *Die ethischen Anschauungen in 'Freidanks Bescheidenheit'*, *Hermæa N.F.*, 25 (Tübingen: Niemeyer)

- Eikermann, Manfred 1998. 'Autorität und ethischer Diskurs: Zur Verwendung von Sprichwort und Sentenz in Hartmanns von Aue *Iwein*', in *Autor und Autorschaft im Mittelalter: Kolloquium Meissen 1995*, ed. Elizabeth Andersen and others (Tübingen: Niemeyer), pp. 73-100
- Ertzdorff, Xenja von 1994. 'Hartmann von Aue: Iwein und sein Löwe', in *Die Romane von dem Ritter mit dem Löwen*, ed. Xenja von Ertzdorff, unter redaktioneller Mitarbeit von Rudolf Schulz. Der tschechische *Bruncvík* sowie das Abenteuer mit dem zweiten Löwen aus dem russischen *Bruncvik* übersetzt von Winfried Baumann, Chloe, 20 (Amsterdam: Rodopi), pp. 287-311
- Eßer, Josef 1987. *Die Schöpfungsgeschichte in der 'altdeutschen Genesis' (Wiener Genesis V.1-231): Kommentar und Interpretation*, Göppinger Arbeiten zur Germanistik, 455 (Göppingen: Kümmerle)
- Fantham, Elaine 1997. "'Envy and Fear the Begetter of Hate": Statius' *Thebaid* and the Genesis of Hatred', in *The Passions in Roman Thought and Literature*, ed. Susanna Morton Braund and Christopher Gill (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), pp. 185-212
- Fisher, Rodney 1975. 'Erecs Schuld und Enitens Unschuld bei Hartmann', *Euphorion*, 69: 160-74
- Fowler, D. P. 1997. 'Epicurean Anger', in *The Passions in Roman Thought and Literature*, ed. Susanna Morton Braund and Christopher Gill (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), pp. 16-35
- Freedman, Paul 1998. 'Peasant Anger in the Late Middle Ages', in *Anger's Past: The Social Uses of an Emotion in the Middle Ages*, ed. Barbara H. Rosenwein (Ithaca: Cornell University Press), pp. 171-88
- Freytag, Wiebke 1972. *Das Oxymoron bei Wolfram, Gottfried und andern Dichtern des Mittelalters*, Medium Aevum, 24 (Munich: Fink)
- Fritsch-Röbler, Waltraud 1998. 'Motivgirlanden: Zur Technik der Motiv-Verknüpfung in Hartmanns *Erec*', *Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen und Literaturen*, 235: 344-49
- Gärtner, Kurt 1982. 'Der Text der Wolfenbütteler *Erec*-Fragmente und seine Bedeutung für die *Erec*-Forschung', *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur (Tübingen)*, 104: 207-30; 359-430
- George, Wilma and Brunsdon Yapp. 1991. *The Naming of the Beasts: Natural History in the Medieval Bestiary* (London: Duckworth)
- Gerhardt, Christoph 1970. 'Wolframs Adlerbild Willehalm 189,2-24', *Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum und deutsche Literatur*, 99: 213-22
- Gerlach, P. 1970. 'Igel', in *Lexikon der christlichen Ikonographie*, ed. Engelbert Kirschbaum, 8 vols (Rome: Herder, 1968-76), II, 335-36
- Gibbs, Marion E. 1972. *Wîplîchez wîbes reht: A Study of the Women Characters in the Works of Wolfram von Eschenbach*, Duquesne Studies: Philological Series, 15 (Duquesne: Duquesne University Press)



- Gier, Albert 1985. 'Ein mehrdeutiges Tier: Der Löwe im französischen Mittelalter', in *Der Braunschweiger Burglöwe: Bericht über ein wissenschaftliches Symposium in Braunschweig vom 12.10 bis 15.10.1983*, ed. Martin Gosebruch, Schriftenreihe der Kommission für Niedersächsische Bau- und Kunstgeschichte bei der Braunschweigischen Wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft, 2 (Göttingen: Goltze), pp. 189-200
- Giese, Albrecht 1968. 'Heinrichs von Veldeke Auffassung der Leidenschaften "Minne" und "Zorn" in seinem *Eneasroman*' (D.Phil thesis, Albert-Ludwigs-Universität, Freiburg im Breisgau)
- Gill, Christopher 1997. 'Passion as Madness in Roman Poetry', in *The Passions in Roman Thought and Literature*, ed. Susanna Morton Braund and Christopher Gill (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), pp. 213-41
- Gill, Miriam 2004. 'Seven Deadly Sins and Seven Corporal Works of Mercy: Schema', <http://www.le.ac.uk/arhistory/seedcorn/schema.html> (January 2004)
- Goldberg, Christine 1996. 'The Ungrateful Serpent (AaTh 155)', *Fabula*, 37: 248-58
- Goodich, Michael E. 1989. *From Birth to Old Age: The Human Life Cycle in Medieval Thought, 1250-1350* (Lanham: University Press of America)
- Gowans, Linda 1988. *Cei and the Arthurian Legend*, Arthurian Studies, 18 (Cambridge: Brewer)
- Graf, Michael. 1989. *Liebe-Zorn-Trauer-Adel: Die Pathologie in Hartmann von Aues 'Iwein'. Eine Interpretation auf medizinhistorischer Basis*, Deutsche Literatur von den Anfängen bis 1700, 7 (Bern: Lang)
- Green, Dennis Howard 1978. 'Homicide and Parzival', in *Approaches to Wolfram von Eschenbach: Five Essays*, by Dennis Howard Green & Leslie Peter Johnson, Mikrokosmos, 5 (Bern: Lang), pp. 11-74
- 1980. 'The Art of Namedropping in Wolfram's *Parzival*', in *Wolfram-Studien VI*, ed. Werner Schröder, Veröffentlichungen der Wolfram von Eschenbach-Gesellschaft (Berlin: Schmidt), pp. 84-150
- 1982. *The Art of Recognition in Wolfram's 'Parzival'* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)
- Groos, Arthur 1981. 'Trevrizent's "Retraction": Interpolation or Narrative Strategy?', *Deutsche Vierteljahrsschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Geistesgeschichte*, 55: 44-63
- 1995. *Romancing the Grail: Genre, Science and Quest in Wolfram's 'Parzival'* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press)
- Grubmüller, Klaus 1991. 'Der Artusroman und sein König: Beobachtungen zur Artusfigur am Beispiel von Ginovers Entführung', in *Positionen des Romans im späten Mittelalter*, ed. Walter Haug and Burghart Wachinger, Fortuna vitrea, 1 (Tübingen: Niemeyer), pp. 1-20
- Haage, Bernhard Dietrich 1992. 'Rez. zu Michael Graf, *Liebe-Zorn-Trauer-Adel: Die Pathologie in Hartmann von Aues 'Iwein'. Eine Interpretation auf medizinhistorischer Basis*, Deutsche Literatur von den Anfängen bis 1700, 7 (Lang: Berne, 1989)', *Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie*, 111: 450-52

- 1993. 'Die Heilkunde in der Artusepik Hartmanns von Aue', in *Kommentar zur Artusepik Hartmanns von Aue*, ed. Lambertus Okken, Amsterdamer Publikationen zur Sprache und Literatur, 103 (Amsterdam: Rodopi), pp. 521-54
- Haas, Alois M. 1964. *Parzivals tumpheit bei Wolfram von Eschenbach*, Philologische Studien und Quellen, 21 (Berlin: Schmidt)
- Habiger-Tuczay, Christa 1999. 'Zwerge und Riesen', in *Dämonen, Monster, Fabelwesen*, ed. Ulrich Müller and Werner Wunderlich, Mittelaltermythen, 2 (St. Gallen: UVK), pp. 635-58
- Hagenlocher, Albrecht 1992. *Der 'guote vride': Idealer Friede in deutscher Literatur bis ins frühe 14. Jahrhundert*, Historische Wortforschung, 2 (Berlin: de Gruyter)
- Hall, Clifton D. 1990. *A Complete Concordance to Wolfram von Eschenbach's 'Parzival'*, Garland Reference Library of the Humanities, 995, Contextual Concordances (New York: Garland)
- Hand, Wayland D. 1942. 'A Dictionary of Words and Idioms Associated with Judas Iscariot: A Compilation Based Mainly on Material Found in the Germanic Languages', *University of California Publications in Modern Philology*, 24: 289-356
- Hankins, James 1987. 'Plato in the Middle Ages', in *Dictionary of the Middle Ages*, ed. Joseph R. Strayer and others, 13 vols (New York: Scribner, 1982-89), IX: 694-704
- Harward, Vernon J. Jr. 1958. *The Dwarfs of Arthurian Romance and Celtic Tradition* (Leiden: Brill)
- Hatto, A. T. 1960. 'Enid's Best Dress: A Contribution to the Understanding of Chrétien's and Hartmann's *Erec* and the Welsh *Gereint*', *Euphorion*, 54: 437-41
- 1980. 'Herzeloyde's Dragon-Dream', in *Essays on Medieval German and Other Poetry*, by A. T. Hatto, *Anglica Germanica*, Series 2 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), pp. 182-99
- Haug, Walter 1975. 'Parzivals *zwîvel* und Willehalms *zorn*: Zu Wolframs Wende vom höfischen Roman zur Chanson de geste', in *Wolfram-Studien III: Schweinfurter Kolloquium 1972*, ed. Werner Schröder, Veröffentlichungen der Wolfram von Eschenbach-Gesellschaft (Berlin: Schmidt), pp. 217-31
- Haupt, Jürgen 1971. *Der Truchseß Keie im Artusroman: Untersuchungen zur Gesellschaftsstruktur im höfischen Roman*, Philologische Studien und Quellen, 57 (Berlin: Schmidt)
- Hempel, Wolfgang 1970. *Übermuot diu alte: Der Superbia-Gedanke und seine Rolle in der deutschen Literatur des Mittelalters*, Studien zur Germanistik, Anglistik und Komparatistik, 1 (Bonn: Bouvier)
- Henkel, Arthur and Albrecht Schöne 1996. *Emblemata: Handbuch zur Sinnbildkunst des XVI. und XVII Jahrhunderts*, Taschenausgabe (Stuttgart: Metzler)
- Henkel, Nikolaus 1988. *Deutsche Übersetzungen lateinischer Schultexte: Ihre Verbreitung und Funktion im Mittelalter und in der frühen Neuzeit. Mit einem Verzeichnis der Texte*, Münchener Texte und Untersuchungen zur deutschen Literatur des Mittelalters, 90 (Munich: Artemis Verlag)
- Henry, P. L. 1982. 'Furor Heroicus', *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie*, 39: 235-42

- Hörner, Petra 1998. *Hartmann von Aue: Mit einer Bibliographie 1976-1997*, Information und Interpretation, 8 (Frankfurt a. M.: Lang)
- Huber, Christoph 1998. 'Lachen im höfischen Roman: Zu einigen komplexen Episoden im literarischen Transfer', in *Kultureller Austausch und Literaturgeschichte im Mittelalter / Transferts culturels et histoire littéraire au Moyen Âge: Kolloquium im Deutschen Historischen Institut Paris / Colloque tenu à l'Institut Historique Allemand de Paris, 16.-18.3.1995*, ed. Ingrid Kasten, Werner Paravicini, and René Pérennec, Beihefte der Francia, 43 (Sigmaringen: Thorbecke), pp. 345-58
- Huby, Michel. 1976. 'Le sénéchal du roi Arthur', *Etudes Germaniques*, 31: 433-37
- Hunt, Tony 1986. *Chrétien de Troyes: Yvain (Le Chevalier au Lion)*, Critical Guides to French Texts, 55 (London: Grant & Cutler)
- Hyams, Paul 1998. 'What Did Henry III of England Think in Bed and in French about Kingship and Anger?', in *Anger's Past: The Social Uses of an Emotion in the Middle Ages*, ed. Barbara H. Rosenwein (Ithaca: Cornell University Press), pp. 92-124
- Jackson, W. H. 1994. *Chivalry in Twelfth-Century Germany: The Works of Hartmann von Aue*, Arthurian Studies, 34 (Cambridge: Brewer)
- Jaeger, C. Stephen 1985. *The Origins of Courtliness: Civilizing Trends and the Formation of Courtly Ideals 939-1210*, The Middle Ages (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press)
- 1992. 'Melancholie und Studium: Zum Begriff »Arbeitsælikeit«, seinen Vorläufern und seinem Weiterleben in Medizin und Literatur', in *Literatur, Artes und Philosophie*, ed. Walter Haug and Burghart Wachinger, *Fortuna vitrea*, 7 (Tübingen: Niemeyer), pp. 117-40
- Johnson, L. P. 1968. 'Lähelin and the Grail Horses', *Modern Language Review*, 63: 612-17
- 1972. 'Dramatische Ironie in Wolframs *Parzival*', in *Probleme mittelhochdeutscher Erzählformen: Marburger Colloquium 1969*, ed. Peter Ganz and Werner Schröder, Publications of the Institute of Germanic Studies, University of London, 13 (Berlin: Schmidt), pp. 133-52
- Jones, Martin H. 1994. 'Changing Tack or Showing Tact? Erec's Self-Criticism in the Second Encounter with Guivreiz in Hartmann von Aue's *Erec*', in *German Narrative Literature of the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries: Studies presented to Roy Wisbey on his Sixty-fifth Birthday*, ed. Volker Honemann, Martin H. Jones, Adrian Stevens, and David Wells (Tübingen: Niemeyer), pp. 229-43
- 1996. 'Schutzwaffen und Höfischheit: Zu den Kampfausgängen im *Erec* Hartmanns von Aue', in *Spannungen und Konflikte menschlichen Zusammenlebens in der deutschen Literatur des Mittelalters: Bristoler Colloquium 1993*, ed. Kurt Gärtner, Ingrid Kasten, & Frank Shaw (Tübingen: Niemeyer), pp. 74-90
- 1999. 'The Significance of the Gawan Story in *Parzival*', in *A Companion to Wolfram's 'Parzival'*, ed. Will Hasty, Studies in German Literature, Linguistics, and Culture (Columbia, SC: Camden House, 1999), pp. 37-76

- 2000. 'Durch schænen list er sprach: Empathy, Pretence and Narrative Point of View in Hartmann von Aue's *Erec*', in *Blütezeit: Festschrift für L. Peter Johnson zum 70. Geburtstag*, ed. Mark Chinca, Joachim Heinzle, and Christopher Young (Tübingen: Niemeyer), pp. 291-307
- Katzenellenbogen, Adolf 1989. *Allegories of the Virtues and Vices in Medieval Art from Early Christian Times to the Thirteenth Century*, trans. Alan J. P. Crick, Medieval Academy Reprints for Teaching, 24 (Toronto: University of Toronto Press)
- Kellermann, Wilhelm 1973. 'Die Bearbeitung des *Erec und Enide*-Romans Chrestiens von Troyes durch Hartmann von Aue', in *Hartmann von Aue*, ed. Hugo Kuhn and Christoph Cormeau, *Wege der Forschung*, 359 (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft), pp. 511-31
- Kellermann-Haaf, Petra 1986. *Frau und Politik im Mittelalter: Untersuchungen zur politischen Rolle der Frau in den höfischen Romanen des 12., 13. und 14. Jahrhunderts*, Göppinger Arbeiten zur Germanistik, 456 (Göppingen: Kümmerle)
- Kern, Peter 1998. 'Text und Prätext: Zur Erklärung einiger Unterschiede von Hartmanns *Iwein* gegenüber Chrétien's *Yvain*', in *Chevaliers errants, demoiselles et L'Autre: höfische und nachhöfische Literatur im europäischen Mittelalter. Festschrift für Xenja von Ertzdorff zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. Trude Ehlert, Göppinger Arbeiten zur Germanistik, 644 (Göppingen: Kümmerle), pp. 363-73
- Kesting, Peter 1978. 'Cato' in *Die deutsche Literatur des Mittelalters: Verfasserlexikon*, ed. Kurt Ruh and others, 2nd edn, 11 vols (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1978-), I: cols. 1192-96
- Kilström, B. I. 1968. 'Bogenschütze', in *Lexikon der christlichen Ikonographie*, ed. Engelbert Kirschbaum, 8 vols (Rome: Herder, 1968-76), I: 317
- Kistler, Renate 1993. *Heinrich von Veldeke und Ovid, Hermaea*, 71 (Tübingen: Niemeyer)
- Kleiber, Georges 1978. *Le mot 'ire' en ancien français (XIe-XIIIe siècles): Essai d'analyse sémantique*, Bibliothèque française et romane, Série A: Manuels et études linguistiques, 41 (Paris: Klincksieck)
- Kluge, Friedrich (ed.). 2002. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache*, bearb. von Elmar Seebold, 24th rev. edn (Berlin: de Gruyter)
- Knapp, Fritz Peter 1976. 'Enites Totenklage und Selbstmordversuch in Hartmanns *Erec*: Eine quellenkritische Analyse', *Germanisch-Romanische Monatsschrift*, 57: 83-90
- 1979. *Der Selbstmord in der abendländischen Epik des Hochmittelalters*, Germanische Bibliothek: Reihe 3, Untersuchungen und Einzeldarstellungen (Heidelberg: Winter)
- Kövecses, Zoltán 1986. *Metaphors of Anger, Pride, and Love: A Lexical Approach to the Structure of Concepts*, Pragmatics and Beyond, VII:8 (Amsterdam: Benjamins)
- Kreutzer, G. 1980. 'Berserker', in *Lexikon des Mittelalters*, 10 vols (Munich: Artemis Verlag, 1980-99), I: 2019-20

- Kugler, Hartmut 1996. 'Fenster zum Hof: Die Binnenerzählung von der Entführung der Königin in Hartmanns *Iwein*', in *Erzählungen in Erzählungen: Phänomene der Narration in Mittelalter und Früher Neuzeit*, ed. Harald Haferland and Michael Mecklenburg, *Forschungen zur Geschichte der älteren deutschen Literatur*, 19 (Munich: Fink), pp. 115-24
- Kuhn, Hugo 1973. 'Erec', in *Hartmann von Aue*, ed. Hugo Kuhn and Christoph Cormeau, *Wege der Forschung*, 359 (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft), pp. 17-48
- Laharie, Muriel [n.d.]. *La folie au Moyen Age XIe-XIIIe siècles* (Paris: Le Léopard d'Or)
- Lecouteux, Claude 1979. 'Der Drache', *Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum und deutsche Literatur*, 108: 13-31
- 1982. *Les monstres dans la littérature allemande du Moyen Age: Contribution à l'étude du merveilleux médiéval*, Göppinger Arbeiten zur Germanistik, 330, 3 vols (Göppingen: Kümmerle)
- Lerchner, Karin 1993. *Lectulus floridus: Zur Bedeutung des Bettes in Literatur und Handschriftenillustration des Mittelalters*, *Pictura et poesis*, 6 (Cologne: Böhlau)
- Le Rider, Paule 1978. *Le chevalier dans le Conte du Graal de Chrétien de Troyes*, 2nd edn (Paris: Éditions SEDES)
- Lewis, Gertrud Jaron 1974. *Das Tier und seine dichterische Funktion in Erec, Iwein, Parzival und Tristan*, *Kanadische Studien zur deutschen Sprache und Literatur*, 11 (Berne: Lang)
- Lexer, Matthias (ed.) 1992. *Mittelhochdeutsches Handwörterbuch*, Nachdruck der Ausgabe Leipzig 1872-1878 mit einer Einleitung von Kurt Gärtner, 3 vols (Stuttgart: Hirzel)
- Little, Lester K. 1998. 'Anger in Monastic Curses', in *Anger's Past: The Social Uses of an Emotion in the Middle Ages*, ed. Barbara H. Rosenwein (Ithaca: Cornell University Press), pp. 9-35
- Lofmark, Carl 1970-71. 'The Advisor's Guilt in Courtly Literature', *German Life and Letters*, 24: 3-13
- Loomis, Roger Sherman 1949. *Arthurian Tradition & Chrétien de Troyes* (New York: Columbia University Press)
- Maczewski, Johannes 1984. 'Wolframs Erzähltechnik im ersten Munsalvaesche-Abschnitt des *Parzival*', *Seminar*, 20: 1-26
- Magner, Carol 1996. 'The Destructive Potential of Anger: An Ancient Theme Given New Life in Heinrich von Veldeke's *Eneasroman*', in *The Reception of Classical Texts and Images*, ed. Lorna Hardwick and Stanley Ireland, 2 vols (Milton Keynes: Department of Classical Studies, The Open University), II: 132-52 (also at: <http://www.open.ac.uk/Arts/CC96/magner.htm> (February 2004))
- Margetts, John 1974. 'Gefühlsumschwung in *Iwein*: minne unde haz, luf and envy', in *Großbritannien und Deutschland: Europäische Aspekte der politisch-kulturellen Beziehungen beider Länder in Geschichte und Gegenwart. Festschrift für John W. P. Bourke*, ed. Ortwin Kuhn (Munich: Goldmann), pp. 452-60

- 1997. '»si enredete im niht vil mite«: Einige Bemerkungen zum *Erec Hartmanns von Aue*', in *Der fremdgewordene Text: Festschrift für Helmut Brackert zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. Silvia Bovenschen and others (Berlin: de Gruyter), pp. 11-23
- Martin, Ernst 1976. *Wolframs von Eschenbach Parzival und Titirel, II: Kommentar* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft)
- Matejovski, Dirk 1996. *Das Motiv des Wahnsinns in der mittelalterlichen Dichtung*, Suhrkamp-Taschenbuch Wissenschaft, 1213 (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp)
- Matthias, Anna-Susanna. 1984. 'Ein Handhaftverfahren aus dem Perceval-/Parzivalroman (Der Prozeß des Urjans)', *Germanisch-Romanische Monatsschrift*, 34: 29-43
- McConeghy, Patrick M. 1987. 'Women's Speech and Silence in Hartmann von Aue's *Erec*', *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*, 102: 772-83
- McDonald, William C. 1988. 'The Fool-Stick: Concerning Tristan's Club in the German Eilhart Tradition', *Euphorion*, 82: 127-49
- McFarland, Timothy 1993. 'Clinschor: Wolfram's Adaptation of the *Conte du Graal*: The Schastel Marveile Episode', in *Chrétien de Troyes and the German Middle Ages*, ed. Martin H. Jones and Roy Wisbey, *Arthurian Studies*, 26 (Cambridge: Brewer; London: Institute of Germanic Studies), pp. 277-94
- McIntyre, James Lewis 1921. 'Temperament', in *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*, ed. James Hastings, 13 vols (Edinburgh: Clark, 1908-26), XII: 233-35
- McKenzie, John L. 1989. 'Aspects of Old Testament Thought', in *The New Jerome Biblical Commentary*, ed. Raymond E. Brown, Joseph A. Fitzmyer, and Roland E. Murphy (London: Chapman), pp. 1284-315
- Mellinkoff, Ruth 1993. *Outcasts: Signs of Otherness in Northern European Art of the Late Middle Ages*, *California Studies in the History of Art*, 32, 2 vols (Berkeley: University of California Press)
- Mertens, Volker 1978. *Laudine: Soziale Problematik im 'Iwein' Hartmanns von Aue*, Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie, 3 (Berlin: Schmidt)
- Mieder, Wolfgang 2001. 'als man daz golt sol liutern in der esse: Sprichwörtliche Ironie und Didaktik in Hartmanns von Aue *Erec*', *Mittellateinisches Jahrbuch*, 36: 45-76
- Milnes, Humphrey. 1961. 'The Play of Opposites in *Iwein*', *German Life and Letters*, 14: 241-56
- Minear, Paul S. 1993. 'Demons', in *The Oxford Companion to the Bible*, ed. Bruce M. Metzger and Michael D. Coogan (New York: Oxford University Press), pp. 162-63
- Mohr, Wolfgang. 1957. 'Obie und Meljanz: Zum 7. Buch von Wolframs *Parzival*', in *Gestaltprobleme der Dichtung: Günther Müller zu seinem 65. Geburtstag am 15. Dezember 1955* (Bouvier: Bonn), pp. 9-20
- 1958. 'Parzival und Gawan', *Euphorion*, 52: 1-22

- 1965. 'Landgraf Kingrimursel: Zum achten Buch von Wolframs *Parzival*', in *Philologia Deutsch: Festschrift zum 70. Geburtstag von Walter Henzen*, ed. Werner Kohlschmidt and Paul Zinsli (Bern: Francke), pp. 21-38
- Müller, Jan-Dirk 1998. *Spielregeln für den Untergang: Die Welt des Nibelungenliedes* (Tübingen: Niemeyer)
- Müri, Walter 1953. 'Melancholie und schwarze Galle', *Museum Helveticum*, 10: 21-38
- Murray, Alexander 2000. *Suicide in the Middle Ages, II: The Curse on Self-Murder* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)
- Naumann, Friedrich 1980. 'Freidank' in *Die deutsche Literatur des Mittelalters: Verfasserlexikon*, ed. Kurt Ruh and others, 2nd edn, 11 vols (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1978-), II: cols. 897-903
- Nellmann, Eberhard 1992. 'Zum zweiten Buch des *Parzival* (Pz. 102,1-8. 109,2-6. 112,5-8. 113,23-26)', in *Wolfram-Studien XII: Probleme der Parzival-Philologie. Marburger Kolloquium 1990*, ed. Joachim Heinzle, L. Peter Johnson, and Gisela Vollmann-Profe, Veröffentlichungen der Wolfram von Eschenbach-Gesellschaft (Berlin: Schmidt), pp. 191-202
- Neubuhr, Elfriede 1977. *Bibliographie zu Hartmann von Aue*, Bibliographien zur deutschen Literatur des Mittelalters, 6 (Berlin: Schmidt)
- Newhauser, Richard 1993. *The Treatise on Vices and Virtues in Latin and the Vernacular*, Typologie des sources du moyen âge occidental, A-VI.C, 68 (Turnhout: Brepols)
- Noltze, Holger 1995. *Gahmurets Orientfahrt: Kommentar zum ersten Buch von Wolframs 'Parzival' (4,27-58,26)*, Würzburger Beiträge zur deutschen Philologie, 13 (Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann)
- Norman, Joanne S. 1988. *Metamorphoses of an Allegory: The Iconography of the Psychomachia in Medieval Art*, American University Studies, IX/29 (New York: Lang)
- Oettli, Peter H. (ed.) 1986. *A First Dictionary for Students of Middle High German*, Göppinger Arbeiten zur Germanistik, 461 (Göppingen: Kümmerle)
- Ohly, Friedrich 1958-59. 'Vom geistigen Sinn des Wortes im Mittelalter', *Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum und deutsche Literatur*, 89: 1-23
- 1992. *The Damned and the Elect: Guilt in Western Culture*, trans. Linda Archibald (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)
- 1995. 'Die Pferde im *Parzival* Wolframs von Eschenbach', in *Friedrich Ohly: Ausgewählte und neue Schriften zur Literaturgeschichte und zur Bedeutungsforschung*, ed. Uwe Ruberg and Dietmar Peil (Stuttgart: Hirzel), pp. 323-64
- Okken, Lambertus 1984-85. *Kommentar zum Tristan-Roman Gottfrieds von Strassburg*, Amsterdamer Publikationen zur Sprache und Literatur, 57-58, 2 vols (Amsterdam: Rodopi)
- 1993. *Kommentar zur Artusepik Hartmanns von Aue*, Amsterdamer Publikationen zur Sprache und Literatur, 103 (Amsterdam: Rodopi)

- O'Reilly, Jennifer 1988. *Studies in the Iconography of the Virtues and Vices in the Middle Ages*, Outstanding Theses in the Fine Arts from British Universities (New York: Garland)
- Panzer, Friedrich 1940. *Gahmuret: Quellenstudien zu Wolframs 'Parzival'*, Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften: Philosophisch-historische Klasse, 1939/40, 1 (Heidelberg: Winter)
- Pauly 1996-. *Der neue Pauly: Enzyklopädie der Antike*, ed. Hubert Cancik and Helmuth Schneider, 15 vols (Stuttgart: Metzler)
- Peil, Dietmar. 1975. *Die Gebärde bei Chrétien, Hartmann und Wolfram: Erec-Iwein-Parzival*, Medium Aevum, 28 (Munich: Fink)
- Peyroux, Catherine 1998. 'Gertrude's *furor*: Reading Anger in an Early Medieval Saint's Life', in *Anger's Past: The Social Uses of an Emotion in the Middle Ages*, ed. Barbara H. Rosenwein (Ithaca: Cornell University Press), pp. 36-55
- Pörksen, Uwe 1971. *Der Erzähler im mittelhochdeutschen Epos: Formen seines Hervortretens bei Lamprecht, Konrad, Hartmann, in Wolframs Willehalm und in den 'Spielmannsepen'*, Philologische Studien und Quellen, 58 (Berlin: Schmidt)
- Psenner, E. 1971. 'Riesen (und Giganten)', in *Lexikon der christlichen Ikonographie*, ed. Engelbert Kirschbaum, 8 vols (Rome: Herder, 1968-76), III: 550f.
- Quast, Bruno 1993. 'Getriuwiu wandelunge: Ehe und Minne in Hartmanns *Erec*', *Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum und deutsche Literatur*, 122: 162-80
- Rehm, Ulrich 1994. *Bebilderte Vaterunser-Erklärungen des Mittelalters*, Saecula Spiritalia, 28 (Baden-Baden: Koerner)
- Reinhard, John Revell 1933. *The Survival of Geis in Mediaeval Romance* (Halle: Niemeyer)
- Reuter, Timothy 1993. 'The Origins of the German *Sonderweg*? The Empire and its Rulers in the High Middle Ages', in *Kings and Kingship in Medieval Europe*, ed. Anne J. Duggan, King's College London Medieval Studies, 10 (London: King's College London: Centre for Late Antique and Medieval Studies), pp. 179-211
- Reynolds, L. D. (ed.) 1983. *Texts and Transmission: A Survey of the Latin Classics* (Oxford: Clarendon Press)
- Richey, Margaret Fitzgerald 1957. *Studies of Wolfram von Eschenbach with Translations in English Verse of Passages from his Poetry* (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd)
- Rieger, Dietmar 1994. 'Il est a moi et je a lui: Yvains Löwe — ein Zeichen und seine Deutung', in *Die Romane von dem Ritter mit dem Löwen*, ed. Xenja von Ertzdorff, unter redaktioneller Mitarbeit von Rudolf Schulz, Der tschechische *Bruncvík* sowie das Abenteuer mit dem zweiten Löwen aus dem russischen *Bruncvík* übersetzt von Winfried Baumann, Chloe, 20 (Amsterdam: Rodopi), pp. 245-85
- Rosenwein, Barbara H. 1998. 'Introduction', in *Anger's Past: The Social Uses of an Emotion in the Middle Ages*, ed. Barbara H. Rosenwein (Ithaca: Cornell University Press), pp. 1-6
- Rowland, Beryl 1978. *Birds with Human Souls: A Guide to Bird Symbolism* (Knoxville: The University of Tennessee Press)



- Ruberg, Uwe 1978. *Beredtes Schweigen in lehrhafter und erzählender deutscher Literatur des Mittelalters, mit kommentierter Erstedition spätmittelalterlicher Lehrtexte über das Schweigen*, Münstersche Mittelalter-Schriften, 32 (Munich: Fink)
- Ruh, Kurt 1977. *Höfische Epik des deutschen Mittelalters, I: Von den Anfängen bis zu Hartmann von Aue*, Grundlagen der Germanistik, 7, 2nd edn (Berlin: Schmidt)
- Schalk, Fritz 1980. 'Über *ira* im Romanischen', in *Romanica Europaea et Americana: Festschrift für Harri Meier, 8. Januar 1980*, ed. Hans Dieter Bork, Artur Greive, and Dieter Woll (Bonn: Bouvier), pp. 516-26
- Schirok, Bernd 1987. 'ich louc durch ableitens list: Zu Trevrizents Widerruf und den neutralen Engeln', *Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie*, 106: 46-72
- Schmid, Elisabeth 1996. 'swes lîp sîn zürnen ringet: Zu einer schwierigen Stelle in Wolframs *Parzival*', in *Wolfram-Studien XIV: Übersetzen im Mittelalter. Cambridger Kolloquium 1994*, ed. Joachim Heinze, L. Peter Johnson, and Gisela Vollmann-Profe, Veröffentlichungen der Wolfram von Eschenbach-Gesellschaft (Berlin: Schmidt), pp. 377-90
- Schmidt, Ernst-Joachim 1979. *Stellenkommentar zum IX. Buch des 'Willehalm' Wolframs von Eschenbach*, Bayreuther Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft, 3 (Bayreuth: Sprach- und Literaturwissenschaftliche Fakultät, Universität Bayreuth)
- Schmidtke, Dietrich 1968. 'Geistliche Tierinterpretation in der deutschsprachigen Literatur des Mittelalters (1100-1500)' (Inaugural-Dissertation, Die Philosophische Fakultät der Freien Universität Berlin)
- 1975. 'Lastervögelserien: Ein Beitrag zur spätmittelalterlichen Tiersymbolik', *Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen und Literaturen*, 212: 241-64
- Schmitt, Jean-Claude 1976. 'Le suicide au Moyen Age', *Annales: Économies, Sociétés, Civilisations*, 31: 3-28
- Schmitt, Wolfram 1985. 'Der "Wahnsinn" in der Literatur des Mittelalters am Beispiel des *Iwein* Hartmanns von Aue', in *Psychologie in der Mediävistik: Gesammelte Beiträge des Steinheimer Symposions*, ed. Jürgen Kühnel and others, Göppinger Arbeiten zur Germanistik, 431 (Göppingen: Kümmerle), pp. 197-214
- Schmitz, Heinz-Günter 1986. 'Iweins zorn und tobeseht: Psychologie und Physiologie in mittelhochdeutscher Literatur', in *Sandbjerg 85: Dem Andenken von Heinrich Bach gewidmet*, ed. Friedhelm Debus and Ernst Dittmer, Kieler Beiträge zur deutschen Sprachgeschichte, 10 (Neumünster: Wachholtz), pp. 87-111
- Schreiber, W. L. 1926-30. *Handbuch der Holz- und Metallschnitte des XV. Jahrhunderts: stark vermehrte und bis zu den neuesten Funden ergänzte Umarbeitung des Manuel de l'amateur de la gravure sur bois et sur métal au XV<sup>e</sup> siècle*, 8 vols (Leipzig: Hiersemann)
- Schröder, Werner 1997. *Laudines Kniefall und der Schluß von Hartmanns 'Iwein'*, Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur Mainz: Abhandlungen der Geistes- und Sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse, 2 (Stuttgart: Steiner)
- Schubert, Martin J. 1991. *Zur Theorie des Gebarens im Mittelalter: Analyse von nichtsprachlicher Äußerung in mittelhochdeutscher Epik; Rolandslied, Eneasroman, Tristan*, Kölner germanistische Studien, 31 (Cologne: Böhlau)

- Schulze, Ursula 1983. 'âmîs unde man: Die zentrale Problematik in Hartmanns *Erec*', *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur* (Tübingen), 105: 14-47
- Schumacher, Meinolf 1996. *Sündenschmutz und Herzensreinheit: Studien zur Metaphorik der Sünde in lateinischer und deutscher Literatur des Mittelalters*, Münstersche Mittelalter-Schriften, 73 (Munich: Fink)
- Sears, Elizabeth 1986. *The Ages of Man: Medieval Interpretations of the Life Cycle* (Princeton: Princeton University Press)
- See, Geoffrey 1991. 'An Examination of the Hero in Hartmann's *Erec*', *Seminar*, 27: 39-54
- Singer, Samuel 1939. *Wolfram und der Gral: Neue Parzival-Studien*, Schriften der Literarischen Gesellschaft Bern: Neue Folge der Neujahrsblätter, 2 (Bern: Lang)
- Sinka, Margit M. 1981. 'Der höfischste man: An Analysis of Gawein's Role in Hartmann von Aue's *Iwein*', *Modern Language Notes*, 96: 471-87
- Smail, Daniel Lord 2001. 'Hatred as a Social Institution in Late-Medieval Society', *Speculum*, 76: 90-126
- Smits, Kathryn. 1981. 'Enite als christliche Ehefrau', in *Interpretation und Edition deutscher Texte des Mittelalters: Festschrift für John Asher zum 60. Geburtstag*, ed. Kathryn Smits, Werner Besch, and Victor Lange (Berlin: Schmidt), pp. 13-25
- Speckenbach, Klaus 1976. 'Von den troimen: Über den Traum in Theorie und Dichtung', in 'Sagen mit sinne': *Festschrift für Marie-Luise Dittrich zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. Helmut Rücker and Kurt Otto Seidel, Göppinger Arbeiten zur Germanistik, 180 (Göppingen: Kümmerle), pp. 169-204
- 1998. 'Rîter-geselle-herre: Überlegungen zu Iweins Identität', in *Erkennen und Erinnern in Kunst und Literatur: Kolloquium Reisensburg 4.-7. Januar 1996*, ed. Dietmar Peil, Michael Schilling, and Peter Strohschneider (Tübingen: Niemeyer), pp. 115-46
- Stauch, Liselotte 1958. 'Drache', in *Reallexikon zur deutschen Kunstgeschichte*, begonnen von Otto Schmitt, ed. Ernst Gall and L. H. Heydenreich, (Stuttgart: Druckemüller), IV: 342-66
- Steppich, Christoph J. 1993. 'Erzählstrategie oder Figureninitiative: Zum Auftritt des "redespæhen Mannes" in Wolframs *Parzival* (229,1-22)', *Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum und deutsche Literatur*, 122: 388-417
- Swisher, Michael 1992. 'Zorn in Wolfram's *Parzival*', *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen*, 93: 393-410
- TPMA 1995-2002. *Thesaurus Proverbiorum Medii Aevi: Lexikon der Sprichwörter des romanisch-germanischen Mittelalters*, begründet von Samuel Singer, hg. vom Kuratorium Singer der Schweizerischen Akademie der Geistes- und Sozialwissenschaften, 14 vols (Berlin: de Gruyter)
- Thoran, Barbara 1975. 'Diu ir man verrâten hât: Zum Problem von Enîtes Schuld im *Erec* Hartmanns von Aue', *Wirkendes Wort*, 25: 255-68

- Tiller, Patrick A. 1993. 'Prince of the Power of the Air', in *The Oxford Companion to the Bible*, ed. Bruce M. Metzger and Michael D. Coogan (New York: Oxford University Press), p. 611
- Tobler/Lommatzsch 1925-. *Altfranzösisches Wörterbuch*, ed. Adolf Tobler and Erhard Lommatzsch, 11 vols (Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung; Stuttgart: Steiner)
- Van den Abeele, Baudouin 1999. 'L'allégorie animale dans les encyclopédies latines au Moyen Âge', in *L'animal exemplaire au Moyen Âge (Ve-XVe siècles)*, ed. Jacques Berlioz and Marie Anne Polo de Beaulieu, Histoire (Rennes: Presses Universitaires de Rennes), pp. 123-43
- Wallace, William A. 1982. 'Aristotle in the Middle Ages', in *Dictionary of the Middle Ages*, ed. Joseph R. Strayer and others, 13 vols (New York: Scribner), I: 456-69
- Wander 1867-80. *Deutsches Sprichwörter-Lexikon: Ein Hausschatz für das deutsche Volk*, ed. Karl Friedrich Wilhelm Wander, 5 vols (Leipzig: Brockhaus)
- Weigand, Hermann J. 1969. 'A Jester at the Grail Castle in Wolfram's *Parzival*', in *Wolfram's 'Parzival': Five Essays with an Introduction*, by Hermann J. Weigand, ed. Ursula Hoffmann (Ithaca: Cornell University Press), pp. 75-119
- Weinand, Heinz Gerd 1958. *Tränen: Untersuchungen über das Weinen in der deutschen Sprache und Literatur des Mittelalters*, Abhandlungen zur Kunst-, Musik- und Literaturwissenschaft, 5 (Bonn: Bouvier)
- Weise, Wilhelm 1910. 'Die Sentenz bei Hartmann von Aue' (unpublished doctoral thesis, Universität Marburg)
- Wenzel, Siegfried 1967. *The Sin of Sloth: Acedia in Medieval Thought and Literature* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press)
- Wetzlmair, Wolfgang 1997. *Zum Problem der Schuld im 'Erec' und im 'Gregorius' Hartmanns von Aue*, Göppinger Arbeiten zur Germanistik, 643 (Göppingen: Kümmerle)
- White, Stephen D. 1998. 'The Politics of Anger', in *Anger's Past: The Social Uses of an Emotion in the Middle Ages*, ed. Barbara H. Rosenwein (Ithaca: Cornell University Press), pp. 127-52
- Wiegand, Herbert Ernst 1972. *Studien zur Minne und Ehe in Wolframs 'Parzival' und Hartmanns Artusepik*, Quellen und Forschungen zur Sprach- und Kulturgeschichte der germanischen Völker, N.F, 49 (Berlin: de Gruyter)
- Wis, Marjatta 1984. 'Zum Problem der *vremder visce hiute* im *Nibelungenlied*: Auf der Spur der Alexanderlegende in der höfischen Epik', *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen*, 85: 129-51
- Woledge, B. 1969. 'Bons vavasseurs et mauvais sénéchaux', in *Mélanges offerts à Rita Lejeune*, II (Gembloux: Duculot), pp. 1263-77
- Woledge, Brian 1986-88. *Commentaire sur 'Yvain (Le Chevalier au lion)' de Chrétien de Troyes*, Publications romanes et françaises, 170 and 186, 2 vols (Geneva: Librairie Droz)
- Wolf, Alois 1977. 'Die *adaptation courtoise*: Kritische Anmerkungen zu einem neuen Dogma', *Germanisch-Romanische Monatsschrift*, 27: 257-83

- Wright, M. R. 1997. 'Ferox virtus: Anger in Virgil's *Aeneid*', in *The Passions in Roman Thought and Literature*, ed. Susanna Morton Braund and Christopher Gill (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), pp. 169-84
- Wynn, Marianne 1976-77. 'Orgeluse: Persönlichkeitsgestaltung auf chrestienschem Modell', *German Life and Letters*, 30: 127-37
- 1998. 'The Abduction of the Queen in German Arthurian Romance', in *Chevaliers errants, demoiselles et L'Autre: höfische und nachhöfische Literatur im europäischen Mittelalter. Festschrift für Xenja von Ertzdorff zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. Trude Ehlert, Göppinger Arbeiten zur Germanistik, 644 (Göppingen: Kümmerle), pp. 131-44
- Yeandle, David N. 1984. *Commentary on the Soltane and Jeschute Episodes in Book III of Wolfram von Eschenbach's 'Parzival' (116,5-138,8)* (Heidelberg: Winter)
- 2001. »schame« im Alt- und Mittelhochdeutschen bis um 1210: Eine sprach- und literaturgeschichtliche Untersuchung unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Herausbildung einer ethischen Bedeutung, Beiträge zur älteren Literaturgeschichte (Heidelberg: Winter)
- Zimmermann, Gisela 1972. 'Untersuchungen zur Orgelusepisode in Wolfram von Eschenbachs *Parzival*', *Euphorion*, 66: 128-50
- 1974. *Kommentar zum VII. Buch von Wolfram von Eschenbachs 'Parzival'*, Göppinger Arbeiten zur Germanistik, 133 (Göppingen: Kümmerle)